

# Sufism and Shari‘ah

A Study of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī’s  
Effort to Reform Sufism

MUHAMMAD ABDUL HAQ ANSARI

The Islamic Foundation

Property of the Library  
Wilfrid Laurier University



## Contents

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Preface . . . . .	5
PART I	
Chapter One: The Life and Mission of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi . . . . .	11
Chapter Two: Sufism . . . . .	31
Definition of Sufism . . . . .	31
Fanā' and Baqā' . . . . .	33
Experience of Union . . . . .	36
Experience of Difference . . . . .	37
Absolute Difference . . . . .	41
Characteristics of the Unitive Experience . . . . .	46
Characteristics of the Experience of Difference . . . . .	52
Status of the Unitive Experience . . . . .	53
The Purpose of Fanā' and Baqā' . . . . .	56
Chapter Three: Sufism and Shari'ah . . . . .	61
Introduction . . . . .	61
The Saintly Way and the Prophetic Way . . . . .	63
Shari'ah and Ma'rifah . . . . .	71
Shari'ah and Haqiqah . . . . .	74
Rules of the Shari'ah and Kashf . . . . .	77
Values of the Shari'ah and Sufism . . . . .	80
Prophet and Prophecy . . . . .	83
Companions of the Prophet . . . . .	88
Wali and Waliyat . . . . .	89
Sirhindī's Claims . . . . .	94
Chapter Four: Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd . . . . .	101
Basic Concepts of Ibn 'Arabī's Wahdat 'l-Wujūd . . . . .	102
Sirhindī's Criticism of Wahdat 'l-Wujūd . . . . .	106
Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd . . . . .	110

Difference between <i>Wahdat 'l-Wujūd</i> and <i>Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd</i> . . . . .	114
<b>Chapter Five: Conclusion – Perimeters of Islamic Sufism</b>	119
Ibn Taymiyah and Sufism . . . . .	130
Notes and References (Chapters 1–5) . . . . .	140
<b>PART II</b>	
<b>Translation of Letters . . . . .</b>	171
<b>Sufism . . . . .</b>	173
1. Nature and Purpose of Sufism . . . . .	173
2. Mystic Experience . . . . .	181
3. Visions and Revelations . . . . .	187
4. Ecstatic Utterances ( <i>Shāfiḥāt</i> ) . . . . .	192
5. <i>Sayr</i> and <i>Sulik</i> . . . . .	201
6. <i>Kashf</i> . . . . .	208
<b>Sufism and Shari‘ah . . . . .</b>	211
1. The Way of the Prophet and the Way of the Saint . . . . .	211
2. Shari‘ah, <i>Tariqah</i> and <i>Haqiqah</i> . . . . .	221
3. Mission of the Prophet . . . . .	228
4. Idea of Perfection . . . . .	236
<b>Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd . . . . .</b>	249
1. Concept of <i>Tawhid</i> . . . . .	249
2. Criticism of <i>Wahdat 'l-Wujūd</i> . . . . .	254
3. Statement of <i>Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd</i> . . . . .	263
4. God . . . . .	277
5. The World . . . . .	288
6. Man . . . . .	305
Notes . . . . .	317
Glossary . . . . .	323
Bibliography . . . . .	341
Index of Names and Titles . . . . .	350
Index of Subjects . . . . .	354
Index of Technical Terms . . . . .	364

## Preface

This book is a study of the ideas of the great seventeenth-century Indian saint and religious reformer, Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī. The Shaykh ranks among the renovators (*mujaddidin*) of Islam for the great service he has rendered. The Muslim community of the subcontinent in his time was passing through a very critical period of its history. Akbar, the Mughal ruler of Delhi, had initiated policies which were seriously affecting Islamic life. His belief was that the religion of the Prophet had run its course and should be replaced by a new religion; in fact, he launched an eclectic religion of his own making. The Sufis, on the other hand, were spreading under the cover of Sufism different beliefs and practices among the masses who had already contracted various forms of *shirk* under the influence of the polytheistic culture of India. The ‘ulamā’ (religious scholars) who were supposed to be the guardians of religion were instead using their expertise to justify un-Islamic practices. Shaykh Ahmad made a Herculean effort to fight these evils. With the help of his disciples whom he posted at key places in India, he tried to spread the ideas of Islam and reform the lives of the people. He also tried to restore Islamic laws and institutions, and raise the status of Muslims in India.

A much more important service was that which Shaykh Ahmad rendered at the level of ideas. A section of scholars at the royal court were challenging the fundamentals of Islam. They denied the necessity of prophecy, doubted the utility of the Sharī‘ah, and advocated the self-sufficiency of reason. Shaykh Sirhindī preached and wrote against these ideas. In his letters, which he sent to many outstanding figures in different walks of life, he demonstrated the limitation of reason in matters of faith, defended the laws of the Sharī‘ah, and established the necessity of prophecy.

The challenge which many preachers of Sufism posed to Islam was even more serious. They had developed a wrong view of Sufism, and of its relation with the Shari'ah. They believed that the Shari'ah was an empty form devoid of reality which they thought lay in their *tariqah* (Sufi path). They did not shy away from exalting their *kashf* (intuition) over the *wahy* (revelation) of the Prophet, nor did they recoil from saying that the real *tawhid* (doctrine of the unity of God) was in Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy of *wahdat 'l-wujud* (the Unity of Being). Influenced by that philosophy some even dismissed the distinction between Islam and *kufr* (infidelity) as of little significance. Shaykh Ahmad subjected these views to searching criticism. He said that the Shari'ah was not simply a system of exoteric rules; it also stated the ultimate truth and defined the reality of religious life. He declared that those Sufis who seek reality outside the Shari'ah run after a mirage. He criticised the doctrine of *wahdat 'l-wujud* and showed that it was incompatible both with the Shari'ah and the experience of difference which the Sufi ultimately realises. He also expounded a philosophy which corresponded to that experience.

This led Shaykh Ahmad to discuss the nature of Sufism, the different levels of mystical experience, the status and characteristics of the unitive experience, the value of mystic revelations and illuminations, the end of the Sufi *tariqah*, and the efficacy of *kashf* as a means of knowledge. He discussed these issues with an openness unprecedented in the history of Sufism, and did not shy away from censuring the ideas of outstanding masters of Sufism if he found them objectionable.

These works are the most solid contribution of Shaykh Ahmad to Islamic thought. They must be treated as the best part of his efforts to renovate Islam. For various reasons, unfortunately, this work has not received the attention which it deserves. We have tried in this book to focus on it, and highlight its importance.

The image of Sufism which Shaykh Sirhindi presents is significantly different in many respects from the image which scholars of Sufism during the last one hundred and fifty years have put forward. If what Sirhindi says is true, and I have

tried to show that it is true in the light of the best tradition of Sufism, the prevalent image has to be seriously modified, and at places drastically revised.

Apart from this serious academic interest, the book has a great practical relevance. During the last fifty years the Muslim world has witnessed great efforts to revive Islam. In general the workers of revivalism are divided into two camps: One puts Sufism at the heart of Islam and bothers little about the question as to what Sufism is consistent with Islam and what is not. The other opposes Sufism and considers it as anti-Islam or, at least, un-Islamic. They do not want to discuss whether Sufism can have a place in Islam. Refusal to discuss such questions by the protagonists of both the views of Islamic revival, has kept them apart from each other, created a lot of misgivings between them, and has hampered the cause which both hold so dear. This book which discusses the ideas of a most outstanding Sufi and an equally great *mujaddid* of Islam will, I hope, throw light on many issues which have divided the servants of Islam, and remove the barriers that have kept them from coming closer to each other.

Discussion of these questions forms one part of the book; the other part contains the translation of some selected letters of Shaykh Ahmad. I hope that the translation will bring the reader directly in contact with the Shaykh, and give him an opportunity to judge the issues for himself. Part of this work was done in India at the University of Visva-Bharati, part in Sudan at the Omdurman Islamic University, and part in Saudi Arabia at the University of Petroleum and Minerals. I am thankful for all the assistance which I have received from these universities and their libraries without which it would not have been possible to complete this work.

**M. Abdul Haq Ansari**

University of Petroleum  
and Minerals,  
Dhahran, Saudi Arabia

## PART I

## CHAPTER ONE

# The Life and Mission of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī

Shaykh Ahmad was born at Sirhind, now in the state of Punjab north-west of Delhi, on Friday the 4th Shawwāl 971 A.H./26th May 1564 A.D., in a family with a long scholarly tradition which traced its descent from the Caliph ‘Umar Farūq. He received his early education from his father, Shaykh ‘Abd’l-‘Aḥad (927/1521–1007/1598) and memorised the Qur’ān. He was then sent to Sialkot, at present in Pakistan. Here he learned logic, philosophy and theology from Mullā Kamāl Kāshmīrī<sup>1</sup> (d. 1017/1608–9), a renowned scholar of rational disciplines; studied ḥadīth with Shaykh Ya’qūb Ṣarfi (d. 1003/1594), the author of a commentary on the *Sahīh* of al-Bukhārī and a Sufi of the Kubrawiyah order; and read some advanced texts of *tafsīr* and ḥadīth with Qādī Bahūl Badakhshānī. Sirhindī completed this education at the age of seventeen and returned home.

Three years later he left for Agra, the capital of the great Mughal Emperor, Akbar (963/1556–1014/1605), and established contacts with the scholars of the court, such as the poet laureate, Fayḍī (954/1547–1004/1595), and his younger brother, Abū ’l-Fadl (958/1551–1011/1602), a distinguished writer and an informal secretary of the Emperor. It is said that he helped the former at times in writing his commentary on the Qur’ān, *Sawāti’ l-Ilhām*, which has the unique distinction of being free from letters containing diacritics. With the latter, however, he found it difficult to carry on. For though Abū ’l-Fadl believed in God, he denied the necessity of prophecy, repudiated the Shari‘ah, condemned worship as hypocrisy, regarded every religion as equally bad,

and pinned faith in reason.<sup>2</sup> Abū 1-Fadl was not the only one to have these ideas; the royal court had many others like him. Sirhindī referred to this situation when he wrote: ‘The people of our times question the very idea of prophecy, deny the possibility of establishing the claim of a particular prophet, and refuse to follow the prophetic Sharī‘ah. This trend is spreading in the people, and some who have established themselves in power are persecuting the ‘ulamā’ and torturing them in various ways which I would not like to mention, simply because they follow the laws of the prophets and believe in them.’<sup>4</sup>

In a discussion with Abū 1-Fadl, Sirhindī contested his ideas and argued the case for prophecy; the former lost his temper and abused the great scholars of Islam. Sirhindī was very shocked and broke with him.<sup>5</sup> When his father was informed of Sirhindī’s disillusionment he came to Agra and took him home. On the way he married him to the daughter of Shaykh Sulṭan, a member of the nobility at Thaneswar, at the latter’s request.<sup>6</sup> Back home Sirhindī took up the study of Sufi texts like the *Ta‘arruf* of al-Kalābādī (d. 390/1000), the ‘Awārif of al-Suhrawardi (d. 632/1234), and the *Fusūs* of Ibn 1-Arabi (d. 638/1240) under the guidance of his father.<sup>7</sup>

At an early age Shaykh ‘Abd 1-Ahad had sought to be initiated into Sunism by the great Chishtī saint, Shaykh ‘Abd 1-Quddūs of Gangoh (d. 991/1583), famous for his ecstasies and his faith in *wahdat l-wujūd*. But the Shaykh advised him first to study the Sharī‘ah and the hadith. Shaykh ‘Abd 1-Ahad returned, took up study, visited various scholars and travelled to a number of places. When he came back, the master had died, and his son Shaykh Rukn 1-Din who was also highly ecstatic and a firm believer in *wahdat l-wujūd*, guided him in Qādirī and Chishtī *tariqahs* and awarded him *khirqah*.<sup>8</sup> Shaykh ‘Abd 1-Ahad, too, believed in *wahdat l-wujūd*, but, as Sirhindī says, was not a blind follower of the doctrine. Some of its concepts, he interpreted in his own way.<sup>9</sup> Sirhindī refers in one of his tracts to a book of his father: *Kanz 1-Haqāiq*,<sup>10</sup> and his biographer, Muḥammad Hāshim Kishmāni, mentions another work, *Aṣrār 1-Tashahhud*.<sup>11</sup>

Sirhindī studied Sufi texts with his father and practised *sulūk* (traversing the Sufi way) under his direction. In his *Mabda wa Ma‘ād* he speaks of his debt to his father: ‘I acquired the *nisbat fardiyah*<sup>12</sup> from my father who had acquired it from a revered Sufi, intensely ecstatic and famous for his miracles . . . I also developed a taste for supererogatory works (*nawāfi‘i*) particularly *nafī* prayers from my father who got it from his teacher, a Chishtī saint.’<sup>13</sup>

After the death of Shaykh ‘Abd 1-Ahad in 1007/1597–8 Sirhindī started for Hajj. On the way, at Delhi, he was introduced to Khwājah ‘Abd 1-Bāqī (971/1563–1012/1603), the first Naqshbandī saint to come to India. Naqshbandis were noted for comparatively stricter adherence to the Sharī‘ah in their *sulūk* and were popular in the lands from where the Mughal rulers had come. Khwājah ‘Abd 1-Bāqī, commonly known as Bāqī Billāh, had come to Delhi only a few months previously, but even in this short period he had become very popular. He persuaded Sirhindī to spend some time with him. Within a few days Sirhindī was so impressed that he offered himself for *bay‘at*, and in the short period of two and a half months attained the Naqshbandī *nisbat*, and then the real self-annihilation (*fana‘-i-haqiqi*) or absolute union (*jam‘ 1-jam‘*).<sup>14</sup> He continued his *sulūk* till he reached the stage of post-union separation (*farg ba‘d l-jam‘*), which the Khwājah called ‘the end of human endeavour’ and ‘the stage of perfection (*maqām-i-takmīl*)’.<sup>15</sup> The Khwājah was very impressed by the wonderful progress of his disciple; in a letter to a friend he wrote:

A man from Sirhind named Shaykh Ahmad has recently come. He is very learned and has great spiritual powers. He has lived with me for some days; on the basis of what I have seen of him in this period, I hope that he will be in future a lamp which will illuminate the world.<sup>16</sup>

After the first meeting Sirhindī returned home, pursued his *sayr* and *sulūk* as the Khwājah had suggested, and kept him informed of the visions and experiences he had. He visited the Khwājah again and spent some time with him. When he intended to return, the Khwājah asked him to teach the *ṭarīqah*, and placed some disciples in his charge. Sirhindī

was hesitant to take up the responsibility, but the Khwājā testified to his suitability for the task.<sup>17</sup> Sirhindī bowed to his judgement and started the work. A little before the death of the master in 1012/1603 he visited him again. On this occasion the Khwājā honoured his disciple by walking some distance to welcome him, and when Sirhindī left he entrusted his sons to him for spiritual guidance.<sup>18</sup>

Sirhindī has described his mystical development at times briefly and at times in detail. The following is a short account of his first experience:

I believed in the *tawhīd wujūd* (i.e. *wahdat 'l-wujūd*) from the time I was a boy. My father apparently believed in the doctrine, and used to carry on spiritual exercises on *wujūd* lines. But in spite of that he was able to maintain in his innermost self (*al-akhfā'*) the state of indeterminateness (*marrabah bi kayf*). As the saying goes, the son of a jurist is half jurist. I knew the doctrine very well, appreciated and enjoyed it. Later on, when God brought me to Shaykh Baqī Billāh, and he taught me the Naqshbandī *tarīqah* and attended closely to my development, the Unity of Being (*tawhīd wujūd*) was revealed to me in a short period in virtue of following the Naqshbandī *tarīqah*. I was completely absorbed in that experience, and the ideas associated with it began to pour in on me. There was hardly a truth that was not revealed to me. I was informed of the profoundest ideas of Shaykh Muhyī 'l-Dīn ibn 'l-`Arabī's philosophy and was blessed with the experience of Divine self-illumination (*tajallī dhātī*) which the author of the *Fuṣūṣ* had said to be the culmination of spiritual ascent, and beyond which there was nothing, according to him, except pure non-being. I also came to know in detail the truths of that *tajallī* which the Shaykh had claimed to be a privilege of the 'Seal of Saints'. I was so much engrossed in that *tawhīd* and intoxicated with it that in one of my letters to the Khwājā I wrote the following two couplets which were the product of sheer intoxication (*sukr*):

This Shari'ah is, alas, the way of the blind.  
Our way is the way of infidels and fire-worshippers.  
Infidelity and faith are the lock and the face of that  
beauty.

In our way infidelity and faith are one.

This condition extended to months and years.<sup>19</sup>

Sirhindī describes the next stages of his mystical development as follows:

After a period I had a new vision of things which dominated my consciousness. But I hesitated at first to revise my attitude towards *tawhīd* (*wujūd*) in deference to, rather than in disregard for that doctrine. I remained in a state of indecision for a long time. At last, I was induced to renounce that doctrine. I was shown that *tawhīd* (*wujūd*) was a lower stage, and was asked to move to the stage of *zilliyat* (i.e. the vision that things are the shadows of God and different from Him). But I did not like to move from that stage since many Sufis were stationed there. But I had no choice. I was brought to the stage of *zilliyat*, where I realised that I and the world were shadows.

I wished I had not moved again from that stage of *zilliyat* because it had an affinity with *wahdat 'l-wujūd* which was still a symbol of perfection for me. But it happened that God by a pure act of grace and love carried me beyond that stage and brought me to the stage of '*abdīyat*' (i.e. the vision that man is nothing more than a servant of God, that things are merely His creation and that He is absolutely other and different from the world). At that time I realised the greatness of that stage and scanned its lofty heights. I regretted my earlier experiences, turned to God and begged for His mercy. Had I not been guided in this manner and shown the greatness of one stage after the other, I would have remained at the stage of *tawhīd* (*wujūd*) because in my view there was no stage higher than that. God alone establishes the truth and shows the way.<sup>20</sup>

I have quoted these rather long passages in order to introduce the reader to Sirhindī's own account of his mystical development. This will remove, I hope, the doubts which some writers<sup>21</sup> of our times have raised about his experiences since he does not fit their view of Sufism.

Sirhindī has characterised the three stages of his experience in metaphysical terms: the Unity of Being (*tawhīd wujūd*)/*wahdat 'l-wujūd*; shadowism (*zilliyat*) and creaturehood or servanthood ('*abdīyat*). Put in purely mystical language they represent the stage of union (*jam*) or rather non-difference

(*jam* 'l-jam'), separation after union (*farg ba'd l-jam*), and absolute difference. The first two stages are common and widely attested by Sufis, but the last is somewhat uncommon, though by no means rare.

Sirhindī mentions these stages time and again<sup>22</sup> for two reasons: He wants first to bring home to the mystics of his day, most of whom were moving at the first stage or stationed at the second, that there is a higher stage of mystic experience at which one stops seeing that man is one with God or that the world and God are One Being, and realises instead that God is completely different and absolutely other, that the world has nothing in common with God, and that man is simply a creature and a servant. Secondly, he wants to underline that the truth of God's absolute transcendence is not for him a matter of faith which a common believer has, nor an intellectual conclusion at which a theologian arrives, but a fact of his own experience to which he was brought against his wish and expectation.

After the death of Khwājah 'Abd 'l-Bāqī, Sirhindī settled down at Sirhind, and devoted himself for the rest of his life single-mindedly to some great works. He seldom left Sirhind, except a few times for Delhi and Agra, and then, too, for the cause he struggled for.

The first task to which Sirhindī addressed himself was to preach and popularise the Naqshbandī *tariqah*. People came to him from different parts of India, north and south, east and west, seeking spiritual guidance. He instructed them and supervised their progress, and when they had attained a level of perfection, sent them back to their native places to preach the *tariqah* there. Those who were more gifted he sent to important cities of India such as Lahore, Delhi, Agra, Saharanpur, Badayun, Jawnpur, Allahabad, Mankapur, Patna, Mangalkot (Bengal), Burhanpur (Deccan)<sup>23</sup> etc, and asked them to spread the views and the practices of the order (*silsilah*). How popular the *silsilah* became can be ascertained by a remark of Jahāngīr, (1014/1606–1037/1627), son and successor of Akbar which he wrote sixteen years after Sirhindī had started his work: 'The disciples of the Shaykh have spread all over the cities and the towns of India.'<sup>24</sup> The *silsilah* was not confined to India. It spread to

Afghanistan and Turkistan, the lands of the first Naqshbandī saints, and to Tabristan and Iran. Sirhindī sent his deputies (*khulafā*) to Shadman (Ispahan), Husayn Abdal (Kabul), Kisham (Badakhshan), Berk (near Qandahar) and Taliqan. He kept himself constantly in touch with his deputies from whom he heard about the problems they faced and the questions which people asked them about the *tariqah*, to which he replied with advice and instructions. In these letters<sup>25</sup> Sirhindī mentions the distinctive features of the Naqshbandī *tariqah*, in particular its strict adherence to the Sunnah. It avoids, he says, musical sessions (*sazā*), dervish dances (*raqṣ*) and *dhikr* with loud voice; it eschews austere practices and severe exercises, and observes moderation in food, drink, sleep and dress. It disparages ecstasy (*wajd*), visions (*mushāhadāt*) and illuminations (*tajalliyāt*), censures boastful claims and ecstatic statements (*shāfiṭāt*); and subjects mystical revelations (*makhfūfat*) to the 'doctrines of the Shar'. It holds that the goal of *tagawwuf* is neither union with God, nor participation in His attributes, but simply to obey the Sharī'ah and to be a faithful servant of God. There is no stage higher than the stage of servanthood (*abdiyat*). The propagation of the Naqshbandī *tariqah* and the purification of souls, however important that may be, was only a part of the task which Sirhindī had set himself. 'I have not been created', he said, 'for the spiritual direction of the people and their self-perfection. The purpose of my creation is different, and I have a different mission.'<sup>26</sup> He considered himself to be more than a wali, a renovator (*mujaddid*) of religion, who had been commissioned to revive Islam at the turn of its second millennium.<sup>27</sup> Although he did not elaborate, there is no doubt that he had a very clear conception of his mission and what it required in his day. Judging from the work he did, we can safely say that his mission was to criticise unbelief, heresy and false doctrines, and reaffirm faith in prophecy, revelation and the religion of the Prophet; to condemn evil, disobedience and innovation, and revive virtue, piety and adherence to the Sunnah; to oppose anti-Islamic forces and powers and restore Islamic institutions and laws. Sirhindī used all his powers of mind and heart to achieve these ends. He wrote books and tracts<sup>28</sup> wherein

he attacked the erroneous ideas and practices of every section of society – masses, scholars, Sufis and statesmen – explained what is true faith and right piety and defended them on the grounds of the Qur'ān and Sunnah, reason and sane Sufi practices. He wrote letters to important personalities in every walk of life, in colleges (*madrassas*), cloisters (*khāngāhs*), army and government, urging them to reform the views and practices of the people under their influence and to realise the great responsibility which God has placed on their shoulders in this regard. He sent to them his emissaries, and travelled to see them personally when he considered it helpful. He used the network of his disciples, spread throughout the whole of India and outside India, to urge people to give up false beliefs and evil innovations, to follow the Shari'ah and adhere to the Sunnah of the Prophet. He had several copies of his letters (the medium for the propagation of his ideas) made and distributed among the people. In the following pages I will review briefly the work that Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi did.

A section of the society, small in number yet quite influential, was that of the scholars at the royal court. I have already mentioned Abū 'I-Fadl; besides him there was his father, Mullā Mubārak Nāgawri (d. 1001/1593) who initiated Akbar into heterodoxy,<sup>29</sup> Fath Allāh Shirāzī (d. 997/1588) who headed a committee to examine the rationality of the Sharī'ah,<sup>30</sup> Sharif Āmulī whom Akbar deputed later in Bengal to preach his new religion,<sup>31</sup> just to mention a few. These people had learned Greek philosophy and acquainted themselves to some extent with Indian thought mostly by their contact with Hindu pundits at the court. They objected to the belief in prophecy and revelation, and denied the need for a Divine Shari'ah. To counteract this trend Sirhindi wrote his first book, *Defence of Prophecy* (*Iḥbāt 'l-Nubūwah*), when he was at Agra. After a brief mention of the situation at the court, from which I have already quoted, Sirhindi enters into a detailed discussion of the nature, function and necessity of prophecy, and the method to establish the claim of a particular prophet. He upholds the possibility of a super-rational way to knowledge by referring to the phenomena of dream and mystic *kashf*,<sup>32</sup> and underlines the

need for prophetic revelation by showing that human reason is incapable of establishing truths beyond the world of perception, and that mystic *kashf*, which is another alternative, is not infallible, especially in view of the fact that such revelations vary from one mystic to another.<sup>33</sup> The only reliable source is the prophetic *wahy*. So far as the establishment of a particular claim to prophecy is concerned, Sirhindi bases his argument on the life, message and work of the prophet in addition to the miracles that he performs. In the case of Muhammad, peace be upon him, his argument centres on the Qur'ān, his exemplary life, the perfection of his Shari'ah and its impact on society. The *Defence of Prophecy* is a concise, cogent and forceful work on the subject. In this and other theological discussions scattered over many of his letters Sirhindi draws upon the whole theological tradition of Islam, above all the Māturidi theology (*kalām*) prevailing in Central Asia. But one also comes across many fresh insights and new arguments particularly in discussions on the essence and attributes of God, freedom of will, and responsibility for belief in God before revelation, not to mention his theosophical doctrine of *wahdat 'l-shuhūd*, to which I have devoted a separate section.

Along with prophecy the honour of the Companions (*sahābah*) of the Prophet was also under attack. A campaign of vilification was launched by Shī'ahs throughout the country with renewed vigour, following the revival of similar activity in Iran, against the first three caliphs for depriving 'Ali, as they said, of the right to succeed the Prophet, and against 'Ā'ishah, Tālhah, Zubayr and Mu'āwiyah who opposed and fought 'Ali afterwards. Those who supported these Companions were also cursed; this amounted to the condemnation of the entire community of Companions except a few members of 'Ali's house and his supporters. The campaign at the Agra court was carried out by Shī'ah scholars headed by Qādi Nūrullāh Shūshtarī,<sup>34</sup> in the south it was led by the successors of Burhān Nizām Shāh (1508–53) who had recently employed hundreds of people in order to abuse the Companions and kill those who resisted them,<sup>35</sup> in the north Kashmir was another centre for this campaign. The scholars at Agra published a book refuting the criticism

levelled against them by the Sunnī scholars of Central Asia (*Māwarā-i-Nahr*), and vindicating their own position. This book was projected as a great achievement and was used to strengthen the campaign.

Sirhindī reviewed this work in his book, *Radd-i-Rawāfiḍ* and substantiated the Sunnī position. In it and other letters<sup>36</sup> dealing with the subject Sirhindī tries to show that the Shi'ah practice of condemning and vilifying the Companions of the Prophet is mistaken, degrading and disastrous. First, it is not true that the Prophet nominated 'Ali to succeed him, and the so-called ḥādīth telling of his nomination are forged. Second, it is against the known practice of the first three caliphs to violate the Prophet's decree, as it is against the dignity of 'Ali to subject himself to their authority and falsify thereby his claim, if the Prophet had nominated him. Third, if the Shi'ah position is accepted and the Companions are condemned, it would seriously affect the credibility of the Qur'an which they had collected, and undermine the authenticity of the whole corpus of ḥadīth which they had transmitted; it would further discredit the work of the Prophet if he had spent his whole life instructing men who *en masse* violated the will of their leader when he closed his eyes. In the case of the Companions who opposed 'Ali later on, Sirhindī states clearly that in their feuds the truth was with 'Ali, and his opponents were in the wrong, but their opposition was due to an error in judgement, as many scholars have pointed out, regarding the right course of action, rather than caused by personal motives.<sup>37</sup> Hence they deserve not to be condemned, but to be excused. If anybody thinks that this explanation clears Talhah, Zubayr and 'A'ishah, but not Mu'āwiyah<sup>38</sup> whom Sirhindī would not except, even then the practice of vilification against him after his death is degrading,<sup>39</sup> particularly when he had rendered a number of valuable services to Islam.

Sirhindī's *Radd-i-Rawāfiḍ* was well received; an indication of its popularity is that almost a century later, a scholar of Wali Allāh's calibre chose to write a commentary<sup>40</sup> on it and popularise its ideas.

The life of the Muslim masses was ridden with *shirk* and *bid'at* (unauthorised innovation), due, first, to their contact

with the polytheistic religions and cultures of India. Ignorant of their faith, Muslims participated in the religious rites of the non-Muslims;<sup>41</sup> and prayed to their idols and gods for various purposes; women, in particular, sought their protection against diseases such as smallpox.<sup>42</sup> They joined Hindu festivals such as *rākhi* and *dīpāvalī*; and celebrated the latter by lighting lamps, cooking rice and sending it as a present in coloured pots to relatives and friends as the Hindus used to do on that occasion.<sup>43</sup> The influence of Indian culture had spread to other classes too; a poet of great talents at the court of Khāñj-i-Khāñ in Deccan, for instance, had adopted *kufīr*<sup>44</sup> (the lover of *kuffar*) as his poetic name (*takhalus*). The other cause of the religious degeneration of the Muslim masses was the influence of ignorant and misguided Sufis. At their bidding they made votive offerings (*nadhīr*) to saints (*mashā'ikh*) and offered sacrifices on their graves. Women usually fasted in the name of Sufi teachers, ever need it.<sup>45</sup> Both men and women made special visits to their wives, and observed various rituals in this connection. For instance, they would not break their fast except when food they collected by begging, even though they needed it.<sup>46</sup>

Both men and women made special visits to celebrate the tenth day of Muḥarram, the first Friday night of the same month, when *I-Ragħāib*, and offered prayer (*salāt*) on the twenty-seventh day of Rūm. Sha'bān, the twenty-seventh day of Rūm.

Most Sufis held musical spiritual dances (*raqs*)<sup>47</sup> at, attending the music Prophet,<sup>48</sup> even the son<sup>49</sup> cared more for *dhikr*: *sunnah*, indulging special courses in neglecting prayer. Those who su-

ange  
tion: *fatwā*  
belonged  
explained  
Youshāq  
and his  
things com  
note that  
that were  
acts were  
them to be  
evil all  
alls them the robbers

levelled against them by the Sunni scholars of Central Asia (*Māwarā l-Nahr*), and vindicating their own position. This book was projected as a great achievement and was used to strengthen the campaign.

Sirhindī reviewed this work in his book, *Radd-i-Rawāfiḍ* and substantiated the Sunni position. In it and other letters<sup>36</sup> dealing with the subject Sirhindī tries to show that the Shi'ah practice of condemning and vilifying the Companions of the Prophet is mistaken, degrading and disastrous. First, it is not true that the Prophet nominated 'Ali to succeed him, and the so-called ahādīth telling of his nomination are forged. Second, it is against the known practice of the first three caliphs to violate the Prophet's decree, as it is against the dignity of 'Ali to subject himself to their authority and falsify thereby his claim, if the Prophet had nominated him. Third, if the Shi'ah position is accepted and the Companions are condemned, it would seriously affect the credibility of the Qur'ān which they had collected, and undermine the authenticity of the whole corpus of ḥadīth which they had transmitted; it would further discredit the work of the Prophet if he had spent his whole life instructing men who *en masse* violated the will of their leader when he closed his eyes. In the case of the Companions who opposed 'Ali later on, Sirhindī states clearly that in their feuds the truth was with 'Ali, and his opponents were in the wrong, but their opposition was due to an error in judgement, as many scholars have pointed out, regarding the right course of action, rather than caused by personal motives.<sup>37</sup> Hence they deserve not to be condemned, but to be excused. If anybody thinks that this explanation clears Tālibh, Zubayr and 'A'ishah, but not Mu'āwiyah<sup>38</sup> whom Sirhindī would not except, even then the practice of vilification against him after his death is degrading,<sup>39</sup> particularly when he had rendered a number of valuable services to Islam.

Sirhindī's *Radd-i-Rawāfiḍ* was well received; an indication of its popularity is that almost a century later, a scholar of Wali Allāh's calibre chose to write a commentary<sup>40</sup> on it and popularise its ideas.

The life of the Muslim masses was ridden with *shirk* and *bid'at* (unauthorised innovation), due, first, to their contact

with the polytheistic religions and cultures of India. Ignorant of their faith, Muslims participated in the religious rites of the non-Muslims;<sup>41</sup> and prayed to their idols and gods for various purposes; women, in particular, sought their protection against diseases such as smallpox.<sup>42</sup> They joined Hindu festivals such as *rākhi* and *dipāvali*; and celebrated the latter by lighting lamps, cooking rice and sending it as a present in coloured pots to relatives and friends as the Hindus used to do on that occasion.<sup>43</sup> The influence of Indian culture had spread to other classes too; a poet of great talents at the court of Khān-i-Khānā in Deccan, for instance, had adopted *kufī*<sup>44</sup> (the lover of *kuf*) as his poetic name (*takhalus*).

The other cause of the religious degeneration of the Muslim masses was the influence of ignorant and misguided Sufis. At their bidding they made votive offerings (*nadhār*) to saints (*mashāikh*) and offered sacrifices on their graves. Women usually fasted in the name of Sufi teachers, even their wives, and observed various rituals in this connection. For instance, they would not break their fast except with the food they collected by begging, even though they did not need it.<sup>45</sup> Both men and women made special efforts to celebrate the tenth day of Muḥarram, the fifteenth night of Sha'bān, the twenty-seventh day of Rajab, and the first Friday night of the same month, which they called *Laylat 'l-Raghā'ib*, and offered prayer (*salāt*) in assembly, considering it to be a highly meritorious act.<sup>46</sup>

Most Sufis held musical sessions (*samā'*), indulged in spiritual dances (*raqṣ*) and celebrated the birth of the Prophet;<sup>47</sup> even the sons of Sirhindī's preceptor did not mind attending the music and songs on Thursday nights.<sup>48</sup> They cared more for *dhikr* and contemplation (*fikr*) than *fard* and *sunnah*, indulged in spiritual exercises such as *arba'inat* (a special course of forty days of supererogatory acts), and neglected prayers in assembly (*ba jamā'at*) even the weekly prayers on Fridays.<sup>49</sup> The novices had developed strange ideas about their masters: they believed that they had power to deprive them of their spiritual attainments<sup>50</sup> if they became angry, and to secure God's pardon for their misdeeds if they were pleased.<sup>51</sup>

Those who subscribed to *wahdat l-wujūd* cared little for

the Shari'ah. They believed that the goal of the Shari'ah was to attain knowledge; hence if anyone realised the truth of *wahdat l-wujūd*, he did not have to perform the duties of the Shar'.<sup>52</sup> Some of them disparaged *salāt* because it differentiated between God and the servant;<sup>53</sup> others equated resurrection with the Sufi experience of *fana'*, and denied judgement and punishment.<sup>54</sup> Some even loved to gaze at beautiful faces and hear sweet voices, because they were the manifestation of the Eternal Beauty.<sup>55</sup>

Sirhindi referred to these ideas and practices in his letters and denounced them as *shirk*, *kuff* and *bid'at*. He urged Sufi teachers and *nashā'ikh* to discard these evil practices and reform their lives. To a Sufi teacher at Thaneswar, for instance, he wrote:

To delay the 'ishā' prayer till the second half of the night in order to make the *ṣalāt-i-tahajjud* easy is highly objectionable; it has been condemned as *makrūh taliḥimi* by the Hanafi *fugahā'* . . . This practice must be stopped and the earlier prayers must be repeated . . . You should never recommend the water that you have used in ablution (*wuḍū'*) to the people for drinking; because the water spilt in ablution is dirty according to Abū Hanifah. The *fugahā'* have forbidden its use . . . I have come to know from a reliable source that the disciples of your deputies (*khulafā'*) prostrate before them, and are not satisfied with simply bowing their heads. This is reprehensible, and should be strongly condemned and forbidden.<sup>56</sup>

Sirhindi did not distinguish between good and bad innovation: he denounced every innovation (*bid'at*), provided it belonged to the field of religion. In a letter to a disciple he explained his views as follows:

You have asked how it is that I forbid *dhikr* with loud voice and condemn it as *bid'at*, but do not condemn many other things which had not existed at the time of the Prophet such as the shirt open in front (*lubās farjī*) and pyjamas. Please note that the acts of the Prophet were of two kinds: those that were performed as *'ibādah*, an act of worship, and those that were done as '*urf* and '*ādah*, habits and customs. The acts which were done as '*ibādah*, we consider deviations from them to be evil innovations, and condemn them strongly, for

they are innovations in religion (*dīn*) and must be rejected. But the acts which were done as part of habit and custom, we do not regard deviations from them as innovation, and do not proscribe them. For they do not belong to religion (*dīn*); their existence or disappearance depends upon the custom of society rather than religion.<sup>57</sup>

If we review the practices which Sirhindi has condemned as *bid'ah* we find that they introduce things into religion (*dīn*) which have no textual support, which change the relative priorities among the rules of the Shari'ah, which increase the importance of a thing beyond what the Shar' has itself provided, and which specify time, place and ways for doing things which have been commended by the Shar' but without those specifications. Every *bid'at*, Sirhindi says, changes the recommended course of doing things, and replaces the Sunnah.<sup>58</sup>

Sirhindi laments that the 'ulamā' of the time who are the guardians of religion and whose duty is to save the masses from *shirk* and *bid'at* are themselves involved in those practices. 'The world is drowned', he says, 'in the sea of *bid'at* and delights in its black acts; the 'ulamā' of our time have become the preachers of *bid'at* and destroyers of the Sunnah. No one has the courage to speak against *bid'at* and revive the Sunnah. Most of the 'ulamā' lead people to *bid'at*, and prove that they are commendable and desirable'.<sup>59</sup> The 'ulamā' did not stop at *bid'at*, they moved to change the very face of religion. One 'ālim, for instance, who was the highest authority on religion in the country issued a *fatwā* saying that the Hajj was no longer incumbent<sup>60</sup> as the journey to Makkah was unsafe. Other 'ulamā' at Lahore ruled that changing interest<sup>61</sup> was legal; still others came out with the verdict that prostration before the king for honour was quite proper.<sup>62</sup> One crown of the gnostics' (*taj l-ārifin*), using his insight into *wahdat l-wujūd*, supported this verdict on the ground that 'the king was one with God, nothing less'.<sup>63</sup> The cousin of another gnostic ruled that shaving one's beard was perfectly in order because the inhabitants of Paradise were said to be beardless youths.<sup>64</sup>

Sirhindi deplores these acts as sheer distortion of religion and condemns their perpetrators. He calls them the robbers

of religion (*luqūs-i-dīn*).<sup>65</sup> His wrath is particularly directed against the ‘ulamā’ of the court who shared the responsibility<sup>66</sup> with heretics like Mullā Mubārak and Abū 1-Fadl for leading Akbar away. Superficial and incompetent, they could not defend Islam against the free-thinkers; self-seeking and narrow minded, they discredited religion by fighting between themselves and condemning each other as *fāsiq* and *kāfir*; and corrupt and mean, they degraded themselves by using their authority to amass wealth.<sup>67</sup>

Sirhindī appealed to the God-fearing ‘ulamā’ of the country to realise their responsibility in the situation, and to condemn the evils which had infected the life of the masses and damaged the image of Islam. He warned that any complacency in the matter would be disastrous. To an ‘ālim at Lahore, for instance, where some scholars had legalised interest on the plea of need (*ihtiyājī*), he wrote a long letter wherein he refuted their arguments at length, and urged him to realise his duty of enjoining good and forbidding evil (*amr bi ’l-ma’rūf wa nahi ’anil-munkar*).<sup>68</sup> In another letter which he wrote to Mullā Ahmad Barkī (d. 1026/1617), his deputy at Berk, he urged: ‘Try to spread the knowledge of the Shari‘ah and the rules of *fīqh* at places where ignorance prevails and *bid’at* rules, and do it with the same concern and love which, by the grace of God, you have for your friends . . . Prepare yourself for the task and discharge the duty of enjoining good and forbidding evil which you have towards the people there, and do it only for the pleasure of God.’<sup>69</sup>

In 987/1579 some scholars of the royal court prepared a testimony<sup>70</sup> (*māhdar*), got it signed by others and presented it to Akbar. They testified that Akbar was ‘the most just, most knowledgeable and most God-fearing’, that as such he ranked above the *mujahids*, and that he had the authority to rule in matters in which they differed. Armed with this testimony, Akbar within the next two decades did three things which had far-reaching consequences for Islam and Muslims in the subcontinent. He launched a new Divine Religion (*Dīn-i-llāhi*), drafted by Mullā Mubārak<sup>71</sup> and his son Abū 1-Fadl. He and his loyal scholars entertained the idea that since Islam had completed a thousand years of its life (the natural life-span of a religion) it ought to be replaced

by a new religion. This Divine Religion was so formulated that it incorporated creeds, rites and practices from every religion – Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism and Christianity – except Islam. Its details<sup>72</sup> are very interesting, but I shall not discuss them here. For except its original authors and a few more disciples, in all eighteen, no one took the religion seriously, and there are indications<sup>73</sup> that the head-priest, the Emperor himself, ceased to be serious about it afterwards. It is also worth noting that Sirhindī who contacted Akbar’s other measures, took no notice of his new religion. As a religion it proved a total failure; however, it succeeded in highlighting the religious degeneration and scepticism of the age.<sup>74</sup>

Second, and more important, Akbar gathered at his court men who criticised, flouted and ridiculed Islamic beliefs, practices and personalities. Originally, he started seeking for truth in different religions, but the ambitions of some self-seeking scholars and the rivalries of narrow-minded ‘ulamā’ turned the quest into a campaign against Islam. Faith in God was retained, but everything else was rejected: creation of the world, existence of the angels, resurrection of the body, revelation and prophecy. Eternity of the world and transmigration of the soul were instead affirmed. The life of the Prophet was criticised; his name was expunged from individual names; *ṣalāt* and other rites were flayed, and injunctions concerning lawful (*halāl*) and unlawful (*haram*) were ridiculed.<sup>74</sup> Things did not end here: those who refused to comply and dared to object were humiliated, imprisoned and sometimes exterminated.<sup>75</sup>

Third, and most important, Akbar acted to change the laws and institutions of the country based on the Shari‘ah. He abolished *zakāt* and *jizyah*; withdrew the prohibition of drinking and gambling; forbade marriages between cousins allowed in the Shari‘ah; proscribed more than one marriage, but, ironically enough, removed censure on prostitution; banned slaughter of the cow; prohibited killing of animals on many days of the year; dropped the name of the Prophet and his Companions from Friday sermons; discontinued the Hijrī calendar; introduced new coins marking the new millennium; discouraged the study of Arabic and Islamic

disciplines; stopped or reduced government aid to Arabic schools; and did not seek to fill the Islamic posts which fell vacant.<sup>76</sup>

The effect of these measures was that Islam ceased even to be a religion among other religions: it was constricted and castigated. The revival of Hinduism in northern India by the followers of Chaitanya made the condition worse. At several places the lives of Muslims were threatened, mosques were demolished, and the observance of Islamic rites obstructed. Sirhindī laments the situation in several letters: ‘In the earlier generation non-Muslims freely performed their religious rites in Muslim towns, but Muslims could not practise Islam; if they dared, they were put to death.’<sup>77</sup> ‘The non-Muslims of India are not afraid to demolish mosques and erect temples in their place. For instance, in Kurukshtera there was a mosque and the tomb of a saint. They have been demolished and in these places a very big temple has been erected. Moreover, non-Muslims openly carry out their rituals, but Muslims are powerless to fulfil the Islamic injunctions. During Ekadashi, Hindus fast and strive hard to see that in Muslim quarters no Muslim cooks or sells food on these days. On the other hand, during Ramadān they openly prepare and sell food, but owing to the weakness of Islam, nobody can interfere. Alas the ruler of the country is one of us, but we are in such a miserable state.’<sup>78</sup>

Towards the end of Akbar’s reign a struggle for succession between his sons ensued. Salim secured the support of some influential officials of the court who resented Akbar’s religious policies. He promised<sup>79</sup> to defend the Shari’ah, and ascended the throne under the name of Jahāngīr when his father died in 1014/1605.

Sirhindī was delighted to hear about Jahāngīr’s accession. But he was not sure if Jahāngīr had the will to carry out the promise, or knew how to do so. He therefore made it a point that Jahāngīr’s commitment to the Shari’ah was strengthened and that he received proper advice on the matter. He was also apprehensive of opposing elements that had by no means disappeared. With this reading of the situation he wrote to officials close to Jahāngīr to tell them of the plight of Islam and Muslims in the country and impress upon them the need

to act promptly. To the Ṣadr-i-Jahān (c. 1027/1618) who had tutored Jahāngīr before and enjoyed his confidence as the highest religious authority, he wrote: ‘Now that things have changed and the hostility of the people has subsided, it is the duty of the leaders of Islam, the Ṣadr-i-Islām and the ‘ulamā’ of Islam that they work for the implementation of the Shari’ah. The institutions of Islam which have been demolished must be quickly restored; delay is not at all good, it makes us very uneasy . . . If the king is not enthusiastic to implement the rules of the Prophet, peace be upon him, and if his confidants also excuse themselves, and like to pass their days in peace, life will become difficult and miserable for Muslims who have no means.’<sup>80</sup> To Khān-i-Jahān (d. 1040/1630) another official of the court, he wrote: ‘Since the king listens to your words and gives them weight, it would be really great if you could explain to him briefly or in detail, as you like, the beliefs of the *Ahl-i-Sunnat wa Jamā’at*. Please inform him of the doctrines of the People of Truth (*Ah/l-i-Haqq*) and look for every opportunity to talk about Islam and the Muslims, defend the tenets of Islam and condemn infidelity and heresy.’<sup>81</sup> When Jahāngīr desired to have four ‘ulamā’ to advise him, he wrote to Shaykh Farid, who played a leading role in securing the throne for Jahāngīr, to persuade him to have only one God-fearing and competent ‘ālim, lest rivalries between the ‘ulamā’ disgust him as they had disgusted his father earlier.<sup>82</sup>

Sirhindī also urged the high officials in the provinces to do what they could in their own spheres. He wrote letters to Shaykh Murtadā, the governor of Gujarat, Qulich Khān, the devout viceroy of Lahore, Lālā Beg, the governor of Bihar, ‘Abd 1-Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān, the commander-in-chief of Deccan, and many other important dignitaries. He called upon them to spread the teachings of Islam, to defend the faith, to abolish un-Islamic laws, to restore Islamic institutions, and to suppress anti-Islamic forces. He told them of the great reward that awaited them in the Hereafter even for any small thing they could do, because they would be doing the work of the prophets.<sup>83</sup>

Six years after his accession Jahāngīr married Nūr Jahān, who because of her beauty, culture and great talents estab-

lished unlimited ascendancy over her husband, and by getting her brother appointed as premier and her father an important member of the court, secured full control of the government. With her ascendancy the Shari'ah elements at the court started working against the Sunnis. As Sirhindī exercised considerable influence on the Sunni section, they turned against him. They impressed upon Jahāngīr that because of his great following throughout India, his contact with officers at the court and in the provinces, Sirhindī posed a threat to the kingdom.<sup>84</sup> On the other hand, the Sufis whose ideas and practices Sirhindī had condemned and whose *mashāikh* he had criticised, were not happy with him. When some of his over-enthusiastic disciples began extolling his mystical attainments and publicised his visionary experiences, they came out to denounce him openly.<sup>85</sup> A letter that Sirhindī had written sixteen years previously wherein he had mentioned that in a vision he went beyond the stage of Abū Bakr, aroused strong condemnation from various quarters. Some even called him an infidel (*kāfir*) who deserved to be killed.<sup>86</sup>

In 1028/1619 Jahāngīr called upon Sirhindī to explain the charges levelled against him. In his *Memoirs* where he records the episode, he says that he was not satisfied with Sirhindī's answer, and to chastise him and to pacify public sentiments he ordered his imprisonment.<sup>87</sup> Other sources say that Jahāngīr was satisfied with Sirhindī's answer, but since he did not prostrate in honour when he entered the court, Jahāngīr sent him to jail.<sup>88</sup>

Sirhindī bore the sufferings of his imprisonment with patience; he neither regretted his action nor made any effort to secure release. Believing that he would not have been imprisoned had God not allowed it, he took it as a way of the Lord to bring him closer to Himself.<sup>89</sup> He continued his work in prison with the same vigour as he had done outside. Impressed by his life and preaching, hundreds of non-Muslim convicts repented of their past deeds and embraced Islam.<sup>90</sup>

A year later, Jahāngīr set Sirhindī free, called him to the court, honoured him with a robe, returned his property and offered him a thousand rupees. He gave him the option to go home or stay with him in the camp.<sup>91</sup> Sirhindī chose the

camp, for it provided him with the unique opportunity to preach to the king and people around him. In various sessions which he had with Jahāngīr, he read out the Qur'ān to him, explained its message, discussed the principles of faith, and elaborated the rules of the Shari'ah.<sup>92</sup> This seems to have had its effect. A year later when Jahāngīr conquered the fort of Kangra he showed unusual enthusiasm to enforce some Islamic laws in that quarter. The same year, he forbade the practice of marrying Muslim girls to non-Muslims in Kashmir. He reintroduced the Hijri calendar, engraved an Islamic emblem on coins, rebuilt the mosques that had been demolished, and encouraged Arabic and Islamic learning.<sup>93</sup> Sirhindī spent three years at the camp, accompanied the king on several campaigns and visited many places. When his health started to fail he returned to Sirhind, where he reduced his commitments and devoted himself to *dhikr* and prayer. On 28th Safar 1034/10th December 1624 he met his Lord.

The work which I have discussed above is only a part of what Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī did, and is by no means the best. Far more important in many respects is his work concerning *tasawwuf* and its relation with the Prophetic Islam. For the first time in the history of Sufism, a mystic of his calibre came to discuss mystic experience, elucidate the nature and characteristics of its different stages, and assess their value and significance. Again for the first time, a Sufi of his eminence clearly distinguished between the Prophetic way and the saintly way to God and judged the latter in the light of the former. With an unusual boldness, Sirhindī reviewed the whole history of Sufism, explained what ideas and practices are within the bounds of the Shari'ah and what must be condemned as aberration. Nothing deterred him from censuring any personality, however great, if he or she said or did anything that went against the Shari'ah. He particularly subjected the philosophy of *wahdat 'l-wujūd* to searching criticism, and censured its consequences to Islamic beliefs, values and practices. Last but not least, he expounded a theosophy in place of *wahdat 'l-wujūd* that agreed with the highest mystic experience of difference (*farq*), on the one hand, and the Islamic Shari'ah on the other.

This work,<sup>94</sup> which Shaykh Ahmad himself regards as his best contribution to the revival of Islam, has been little studied and far less appreciated. It is to this part of his work which we now turn.

## CHAPTER TWO

# Sufism

### Definition

We begin the study of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī's effort to reform Sufism by explaining what Sufism is. The earliest Sufis when confronted with this question would not usually define Sufism. They would instead mention a particular aspect of Sufism which they wanted to stress. One thing which emerges from these didactic statements is that Sufism is primarily concerned with the internal state of the soul, rather than external behaviour. It is concerned with virtues like patience, trust and sincerity; feelings like fear, awe and love; attitudes like humility, quietism and withdrawal; and practices like hunger, vigils, remembrance and contemplation, which promote the desired state of the soul.

To the question: 'What is *taṣawwuf*?', Abū 'l-Ḥusayn 'I-Nūrī<sup>1</sup> (d. 295/907), for instance, replied: '*Taṣawwuf* is neither external action (*rasm*) nor knowledge ('ilm), it is all virtue (*khulq*');<sup>2</sup> Junayd<sup>3</sup> (d. 297/909) answered: '*Taṣawwuf* is that your devotion to God is not for any other purpose',<sup>4</sup> and Sahl ibn 'Abdullāh 'I-Tustarī<sup>5</sup> (d. 283/897) responded: '*Taṣawwuf* is to eat little, to seek peace in God and to flee from people'.<sup>6</sup>

The same concern with the inner life is brought out by many writers of our time when they characterise Sufism as 'the code of the heart (*fiqh l-bāṭin*)', or 'the purification of the soul (*tazkiyat l-nafs*)', or 'the feeling of God's presence (*al-īhsān*)'.<sup>7</sup> These descriptions are good so far as they underline the basic orientation of Sufism, and highlight the close relationship that exists between Sufism and the Shari'ah. They do not, however, bring out those elements

This work,<sup>94</sup> which Shaykh Ahmad himself regards as his best contribution to the revival of Islam, has been little studied and far less appreciated. It is to this part of his work which we now turn.

## CHAPTER TWO

# Sufism

### Definition

We begin the study of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi's effort to reform Sufism by explaining what Sufism is. The earliest Sufis when confronted with this question would not usually define Sufism. They would instead mention a particular aspect of Sufism which they wanted to stress. One thing which emerges from these didactic statements is that Sufism is primarily concerned with the internal state of the soul, rather than external behaviour. It is concerned with virtues like patience, trust and sincerity; feelings like fear, awe and love; attitudes like humility, quietism and withdrawal; and practices like hunger, vigils, remembrance and contemplation, which promote the desired state of the soul.

To the question: 'What is *tasawwuf*?', Abu 'l-Husayn 'I-Nūrī<sup>1</sup> (d. 295/907), for instance, replied: '*Tasawwuf* is neither external action (*rasm*) nor knowledge (*'ilm*), it is all virtue (*khuluq*)';<sup>2</sup> Junayd<sup>3</sup> (d. 297/909) answered: '*Tasawwuf* is that your devotion to God is not for any other purpose';<sup>4</sup> and Sahl ibn 'Abdullah 'I-Tustarī<sup>5</sup> (d. 283/897) responded: '*Tasawwuf* is to eat little, to seek peace in God and to flee from people.'<sup>6</sup>

The same concern with the inner life is brought out by many writers of our time when they characterise Sufism as 'the code of the heart (*fīqh 'l-bātin*)', or 'the purification of the soul (*tazkiyat 'l-nafs*)', or 'the feeling of God's presence (*al-ijsān*)'.<sup>7</sup> These descriptions are good so far as they underline the basic orientation of Sufism, and highlight the close relationship that exists between Sufism and the Shari'ah. They do not, however, bring out those elements

of Sufism that help us to understand how the piety of a Sufi differs from the piety of an ascetic and devotee (*zāhid wa 'abid*), or to distinguish between the way of the Sufi (*tariqah-i-walāyat*) and the way of the prophet (*tariqah-i-nubūwat*).<sup>8</sup>

Another understanding of Sufism sees it as a quest for reality, an enlightenment or a gnosis (*ma'rifah*). Elements of this view can be discovered in the words of early Sufis, but a clear formulation of it is not found before al-Ghazālī<sup>9</sup> (d. 505/1111). Ibn 'l-Arabi<sup>10</sup> (d. 638/1240) and other philosophically-minded Sufis hold the same view; and those who regard the experience of *tawhīd* in a quasi-theosophical sense as the ultimate state of Sufism, such as Shaykh 'Abdullāh 'I-Anṣārī<sup>11</sup> (d. 481/1088) subscribe partly to this view.

The gnostic view of Sufism has been very popular with modern scholars, both Western and Eastern. They render Sufism as Islamic or Muslim mysticism, and understand by that term the attempt of the people believing in Islam to know the mysteries of life and the world. Reynold Nicholson, the most outstanding of all Western scholars of Sufism, begins his discussion of Sufism by quoting the words of Ma'rif 'I-Karkhī<sup>12</sup> (d. 200/815) which he translates as: 'Sufism is the apprehension of divine realities.'<sup>13</sup> Titus Burckhardt, another eminent scholar, goes a step further when he makes doctrine, not only apprehension, the criterion of real Sufism, the basis as well as the goal of the Sufi *tariqah*.<sup>14</sup> To be sure, there has been a strong gnostic trend in Sufism. But to say that gnosis is the essence of Sufism, or that gnostic Sufism is the real Sufism, even its predominant form, is quite arbitrary. A proper assessment of Sufism has to pay more attention to Junayd (d. 297/909), the formulator of the Sufi *tariqah*, 'Abd 'I-Qādir 'I-Jilānī<sup>15</sup> (d. 561/1166), Shihāb 'I-Dīn 'I-Suhrawardī<sup>16</sup> (d. 632/1234), and Bahā' 'I-Dīn Naqshbandī<sup>17</sup> (d. 791/1389), the founders of the great Sufi orders, rather than al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) and Ibn 'l-Arabi (d. 638/1240), who though intellectually superior bore no comparison to these great masters of Sufism.

The third approach to Sufism is to define it in terms of the experience of *fana'* and *baqā'*. Junayd referred to it when he said: 'Tasawwuf is that God makes you die to yourself

and live by Him.'<sup>18</sup> Al-Shiblī<sup>19</sup> (d. 334/946) put it in this way: 'Tasawwuf is to rise above the perception of the world.'<sup>20</sup> Abū 'Alī Jūzjānī<sup>21</sup> (d. early third Hijri century) said: 'The Sufi is one who forgets himself and lives in the vision of God, is neither aware of himself nor anything else.'<sup>22</sup> Jāmī<sup>23</sup> (d. 898/1493) defined: 'Walāyat means the effacement (*fana'*) of man in God and his survival (*baqā'*) in Him.'<sup>24</sup>

This is the definition which Sirhindī adopts. He puts it very succinctly: 'Walāyat means *fana'* and *baqā'*.<sup>25</sup> In order to appreciate this definition one has to separate the experience of *fana'* and *baqā'* from the gnosis which it is believed to produce. The essential element of Sufism, in this view, is the experience of *fana'* and *baqā'* itself, not the knowledge associated with it, whose nature and value have been conceived very differently by different Sufis. By stressing the centrality of the experience this definition also provides a criterion to distinguish between Sufism and the ordinary piety of renunciation and devotion, as it helps us to understand, as we shall see later, the difference between the way of the saints and the way of the prophets.

#### *Fanā'* and *Baqā'*

*Fanā'* literally means to die and disappear, and *baqā'* means to live and survive. In the Sufi context, however, the terms are usually used with a preposition: *fanā 'an* means to abstain from something, to forget and to be unconscious of it; *baqā bi*, on the other hand, means to be occupied with something, live in or by it. There is a kind of *fanā'* and *baqā'* when one refrains from vice and practises virtues; there is another kind of *fanā'* and *baqā'* when one shrinks from violating the commands of God and obeys His will.

But the *fanā'* and *baqā'* which is essential and distinctive of Sufism is neither one nor the other: it is an affective experience. In order to have this experience the Sufi has to follow a particular procedure. In his *al-Qawl 'I-Jamīl*, the great Indian scholar and Sufi, Wālī Allāh<sup>26</sup> (d. 1176/1762) describes the procedures which the three major Sufi orders, the Qādiriyah, the Chishtiyah and the Naqshbandiyah prescribe. They agree on basic principles, although they differ

in details. I will summarise below the procedure which is followed in the Qādiriyah order.<sup>27</sup>

A Sufi aspirant has first to pass a preparatory stage. He has to set his beliefs right, discard evil habits, avoid big sins (*kabū'ir*) and abstain from small ones (*saghā'ir*) as much as he can. He should perform obligatory prayers and other duties (*fara'iq*) which the Sharī'ah has placed on him, and observe the Sunnah of the Prophet which he has recommended.

When this is completed, the aspirant can take up *dhikr* with loud voice. Let him begin by saying the name of God (*ism dhāt*) loudly, with one stroke. That is, he should say 'Allah' loudly, stretch the word as he pronounces, and do it with all the force of his heart and throat. He should then pause, regain breath and repeat 'Allah'. He has to do this for some time. Next, he should say 'Allah' with two strokes. That is, he should sit as he does in *salāt*, say 'Allah' pointing first to the right knee and then to the heart. He should repeat the *dhikr* without break. When he strikes at the heart he should do it particularly with full force, so that his heart feels its effect and his mind attains concentration. He should repeat the *dhikr* with three and four strokes [Wali Allāh describes the procedure].

Next he should take up the *dhikr* of negation and affirmation, that is, should say *lā ilāha illā Allāh* [There is no god (negation) except Allah (affirmation)]. Let him sit as he does in *salāt* facing the *Qiblah*, close his eyes and say *lā*, as if he takes it out from his navel and stretches it till it reaches his right shoulder. Then he should say *ilāha*, as if he takes it out from his forehead; then say *illā Allāh* with full force. When he says these words he should think that nothing in the world is worth desiring and loving, nor anything at all exists. God alone is to be sought and loved, and He alone

exists. These two *dhikrs* help to concentrate attention on God, ignite His love and make Him the sole object of one's longing. If a Sufi says them four thousand times every day and night, he is sure to feel that effect within two months. When this is achieved, the Sufi is advised to take up silent *dhikr*. He should close his eyes, shut his mouth, and say in

his heart: 'Allah is Hearing', 'Allah is Seeing', 'Allah is Knowing', raising, as if, the words from his navel to his heart, to his brain and then to the throne of God. The second time he should do it in the reverse order, beginning with the throne of God, going to the brain, to the heart and then to the navel. He should do the same with the *dhikr* of negation and affirmation. As a result of these *dhikrs* the Sufi is sure to develop intense longing and passionate love for God, achieve complete concentration, love silence, avoid intercourse with people, hate to be involved in worldly affairs and devote himself exclusively to God.

He is now ready to enter into meditation (*murāqabah*). He should meditate on, for instance, 'Allah is before me', 'Allah sees me', 'Allah is with me'. He should imagine how God is present to him, sees him, and is with him clearly and vividly, but placing Him above space, and concentrate on it till he is completely absorbed in it. He may meditate on the Qur'ānic verse, 'He is with you wherever you are'<sup>28</sup> or 'Whichever way you turn there is the face of Allah'<sup>29</sup> or 'We are nearer to him than his jugular vein. . .'<sup>30</sup> These meditations will produce absorption in God. However, if the Sufi meditates on 'Everything on the earth will perish, only the face of your Lord, the Glorious and the Majestic will survive',<sup>31</sup> he will lose every interest in the world and will be completely absorbed in God in a state of intoxication (*sukr*) and effacement (*māhw*). The proper way to attain it is to imagine that you are dead, reduced to ashes that are blown about by the wind, that the heavens have split, and everything has disintegrated and vanished, and that only God is there. If you persist in this meditation for some time you will forget yourself and obtain complete effacement. This is the beginning of *fana'*. As the Sufi advances in meditation, he rises to higher stages of the experience. But even from this description, the nature of the experience is quite clear. It is obviously not a matter of *khulq*, abstaining from vice and practising virtue; nor a matter of action, avoiding disobedience to God and carrying out His will. It is essentially a matter of feeling (*hāl*), an affective experience. Any definition of Sufism which does not take this fact into consideration is inadequate.

## Experience of Union

*Fanā'* and *baqā'* are the two sides of the same experience. Looking from one angle, it is a negation of the mystic: negation of his will, his attributes, his self-consciousness and his being. Looking from another angle, it is union with God and assimilation in Him: assimilation into His will, His attributes and finally His being. The former aspect, Sufis refer to by words like disappearance (*fanā'*), effacement (*mahw*), dissolution (*idmihlāl*), and unconsciousness (*ghaybah*); the second aspect, they call meeting (*wiṣād*), union (*jam*), unification (*ittihād*), oneness (*tawhīd*) and identity ('ayniyah), depending upon the degree of self-negation and union.

Two levels of union are usually distinguished: One at which the mystic experiences oneness with God, but he is also conscious of his difference from Him; this is called the stage of union (*maqām-i-jam*). At the next stage the consciousness of difference vanishes altogether, and the mystic is conscious of One Being beyond difference and distinction. Sufis call it the stage of absolute union (*jam* 'i-jam', literally 'union of union'). Al-Ghazālī describes absolute union in the following words:

When the gnostics reach the height of experience they testify without exception that they do not see anything in existence except the One Real Being (*al-Haqq*). For some, this is an intellectual realisation. For others however, it becomes a matter of affective experience (*hāl-an wa dhabiq-an*); plurality vanishes for them altogether. They are absorbed into Pure Unity (*al-fardāniyyat i-mahdah*), losing their intellects completely, stunned and bewildered. They are no more conscious of anything other than God, nor even themselves. Nothing exists for them except God; as a result they exclaim in a state of intoxication (*sukr*) which removes the control of reason. One of them said: 'I am God'; another said: 'Glory to me, how great I am'; a third said: 'There is none in these clothes except God.' When this experience overwhelms the mystic it is called extinction (*fanā'*), rather extinction of extinction (*fanā' i-fanā'*). For he becomes unconscious of himself and unconscious of his unconsciousness (*fanā'*), because he is not aware of his self in this state, nor of his forgetfulness of himself. For if he were aware of his self-forgetfulness, he

would have been aware of himself. This state is called unification (*ittihād*) in the language of metaphor (*majūz*), and in the language of reality (*al-haqīqah*) affirmation of unity (*tawhīd*).<sup>32</sup>

## Experience of Difference

The belief common among people about unitive experience is that it is the final experience of the Sufi and the ultimate point of his ascent. Consequently his movement from the distinctionless unity to an awareness of distinction between God and him is regarded as a 'descent', a relapse to the original stage of difference, a sliding down the hill after reaching the top. Many factors have contributed to this belief: statements of Sufis applauding union; the characterisation of the consciousness of difference after union as a return (*rujū'*) and a descent (*nuzūl*); the metaphysical consideration of positing unity as the source of all plurality; the doctrine of *wahdat i-wujūd* which supports and is supported by the experience of unity; and the claim of mystics in other traditions that absolute unity is the highest truth.

The experience of distinctionless unity is, however, not the ultimate experience of the Sufi. There is beyond it a second experience of difference, a separation after union (*farr ba'd i-jam*). Abū 'l-Qāsim 'I-Qushayrī<sup>33</sup> (d. 465/1072), the most perceptive of all the early Sufi writers says:

After this (i.e., the experience of *jam* 'i-jam' or absolute union) there is a glorious state (*hālat 'azizah*) which the Sufis call second separation (*al-farr i-thani*), that is the state when the Sufi is returned to sobriety (*al-qāshw*) at the time of obligatory prayers (*fari'i id*) so that he may perform his duties at their times. His return (*rujū'*) is, therefore, for God and with God, not for him and with him. He perceives in this state that God controls him completely, that He is the Originator of his essence and existence by His own power, and the Producer of his acts and states by His knowledge and will.<sup>34</sup>

In this important statement al-Qushayrī makes a few things quite clear. First, there is a stage beyond the stage of absolute

union which in contrast to the latter is marked by distinction and difference. Second, the post-union difference is completely different from the pre-union separation in that it is a state of living ‘for God, with God’, whereas the latter is a living ‘for man, with man’. Hence it is not a relapse to the pre-union separation. It is in fact a movement from the state of difference-less union to a state of difference-in-union, wherein the Sufi becomes conscious of himself, but not as existing or moving by himself, but as ‘exist-ed’ and moved by God through His knowledge, power and will. Third, the state of difference after union is a higher state. Al-Qushayri calls it *‘hālāt ‘azīzah*, which may be rendered as a great experience or a sublime state. On either rendering it is a higher state of life. To be sure, the absolute union devoid of distinction is the logical end of the unitive process. But it does not follow thereby that it is also the most perfect experience, and the highest point of spiritual ascent.

These points which al-Qushayri has made, can be substantiated by quoting extensively from other Sufis. I would, however, confine myself to only three: Abū Yazid<sup>35</sup> (d. 261/875), Ibn 1-‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) and Wali Allāh (d. 1176/1762), of whom the first is believed to be a pantheist, the second is the founder of *wahdat l-wujūd*, and the third is an interpreter of that doctrine.

I have discussed Abū Yazid’s experience at length elsewhere.<sup>36</sup> I will, therefore, quote only one of his statements:

Union (*wasḥ*) is from separation (*fasiḥ*), then separation comes after union. Both have a name and a referent, and the experiences to which they refer have well-known properties. When the mystic unites after his separation he is introduced to (God’s) unknown eternity (*ghayb azal-i-hi*). But when he advances to perfection separation comes back, but now it is a separation which does not annul union, nor does it negate separation.<sup>37</sup>

This is a very important statement, particularly since it comes from a Sufi who is famous for his words of union and unity. It clearly supports all the points which al-Qushayri has made: that there is an experience of separation after union, that

this separation is different in nature from the pre-union separation because it is a union as well as separation, and that it is a higher and more perfect experience. Ibn 1-‘Arabī disparages the experience of absolute union as ignorance and cautions against it:

The union (*jam*) which negates all difference while you experience it is not to be counted upon; it is ignorance (*jahl*).<sup>38</sup>

This remark is in full agreement with Ibn 1-‘Arabī’s philosophical position that the difference between man and God is as much true as their unity. Therefore, an experience which discloses unity and conceals difference is lower than the experience which brings out both the aspects of reality. In the *Futūhāt*, after saying that the experience of *jam* conceals the reality of man’s difference from God as His servant, he observes: ‘An experience which removes the thing from its true position and conceals from it its reality deserves no credit in our eyes, because it shows the thing different from what it is, and drags you down to the level of the ignorants.’<sup>39</sup>

Wali Allāh in the beginning of a treatise on *wahdat l-wujūd* and *wahdat l-shuhūd* after observing that the terms are used in two different contexts, philosophical and mystical, writes regarding the latter use:

The meaning of *wahdat l-wujūd* (in the mystical context) is that the mystic is so absorbed in the contemplation of the All-Embracing Existence (*al-Wujūd l-Munbasit*)<sup>40</sup> of which the world is a determination that distinctions and differences vanish which form the basis of our knowledge of good and evil, and which the *Shar‘* and reason categorically affirm and fully elaborate. This is the stage where the mystics stay unless God takes them beyond. *Wahdat l-shuhūd*, on the other hand, means in this context the consciousness both of oneness and difference, that is the consciousness that things are one in one sense and multiple in another. This stage is higher and more perfect than the former.<sup>41</sup>

We are not concerned here with Wali Allāh’s rather strange way of characterising the two levels of mystic experience in terms of *wahdat l-wujūd* and *wahdat l-shuhūd*. What we

should note is that for a Sufi like Wali Allāh who defends the basic thesis of *wahdat 'l-wujūd*, the experience of absolute union in which differences and distinctions vanish is a lower experience compared to the experience which reveals both oneness and difference.

Every Sufi does not move from the stage of pure union to the stage of difference in union; some stay, as Wali Allāh observes, at the first stage. Most of the Sufis whom al-Qushayrī mentions in the *Risālah* and al-Sulamī in the *Tabaqāt* have passed on, Sirhindī says,<sup>42</sup> sooner or later to the second stage; their words which speak of pure union and give no indication of difference should not, therefore, be taken to represent their final experience. Abū Yazid, for instance, who is famous for his words of union experienced, Sirhindī believes, the second difference towards the end of his life. He thinks that Abū Yazid's words, 'I did not know You except after an unknowing and did not serve You except after the lapse of a period'<sup>43</sup> refer to it. This view of Abū Yazid's final experience is supported by the words which I have quoted earlier regarding the experience of difference after union. They refer, to be sure, to his personal experience; Abū Yazid is not in the habit of making academic observations.

Abū Bakr 'l-Shiblī is another case. Most of the references to his life, experiences and words preserved in early sources belong to his unitive period. He, however, moved from this to the stage of difference. An indication of it is found in the words he said at that stage about Abū Yazid: 'Had Abū Yazid been here, he would have entered into Islam (of *tariqah*, which is another name for the separative experience) at the hand of any of our disciples.'<sup>44</sup> What is true of Abū Yazid and al-Shiblī is also true of Abū 'l-Husayn 'l-Nūrī, Abū Ḥamzah<sup>45</sup> (d. 269/882) and others among the early Sufis. Sirhindī only excepts al-Ḥallāj,<sup>46</sup> who, in his view, remained at the stage of union and died in that state.<sup>47</sup>

The experience of difference in union, though higher than the experience of pure union is not however the final stage of the mystic experience. There is still a higher stage. In the previous chapter I have mentioned three stages of Sirhindī's experience: the first stage wherein he sees the world one with God, the second wherein he sees that the world is a shadow of God, different from God, yet in some sense one with Him, and the third wherein he sees God completely different from the world and absolutely other. In Letter 290<sup>48</sup> of the first volume of his collected letters Sirhindī describes the experience in detail. Let us review it here.

The first experience that Sirhindī had was a feeling of self-negation (*bi khudi*) or forgetfulness (*ghaybah*) in which he 'saw a vast ocean and found that the forms of things appeared as shadows in that ocean'. When this feeling intensified and overwhelmed Sirhindī, his preceptor said that he had attained a kind of *fana*'. Now he 'saw the whole world as one and found it united with the One', and thereafter went into a state of unconsciousness (*bi shu'ūrī*) in which he felt he had 'a direct experience of God', and found that 'his attributes in reality belonged to God'. This was the stage of *fana*' *l-fanā'*, the passing away of the passing away.

Next Sirhindī had a vision of God 'under the veil of light, which encompassed everything'. His preceptor confirmed that he had seen God, but asked him to negate that vision. Sirhindī continued his work; the light that he had seen, started contracting, till there remained just a point; which, too, vanished in the end. He was thrown into wonder wherein 'God was visible to him by himself and through himself'. His preceptor remarked that he had achieved the *nisbat*<sup>49</sup> of the Naqshbandiyah.

Sirhindī experienced next an extraordinary expansion of the heart. He writes: 'The whole world, from the Divine Throne to the centre of the earth, was no more than a small grain as compared to that expansion. After that I saw myself and every object of the world separately one with me, and I saw myself one with all of them, till I found that the whole world was hidden in one particle. After that I saw myself, rather each particle, so much expanded and enlarged that it

could contain the whole world, rather many more worlds in it. I saw myself and each particle as an expanding light entering into every particle so that all forms and shapes of the world had vanished into it. After that I found myself, rather every particle sustaining the world.' His preceptor called this stage the union of union (*jam' l-jam*).

The next experience Sirhindī describes as follows: 'After that the forms and shapes of the world that I had found to be God before I now saw were imaginary, and every particle that I had found to be God without difference and distinction I now saw were illusory. I was thrown into complete wonder.' When Sirhindī reported the experience to his preceptor, he said: 'The presence (*ḥudūr*) of God that you have is not clear. Continue your work till the Existant is differentiable from the illusory (*mawhūm*).' Sirhindī continued till he was shown the difference between the Existant (i.e. God) and the illusion (i.e. the world). 'I realised', he says, 'that the real Being is other than the illusory (*mawhūm*); I found that the attributes of the illusory and the acts and effects that proceeded from it really proceeded from God. I realised also that those attributes and acts were absolutely illusory (*mawhūm māhāt*) and there was nothing in existence except God'. When Sirhindī reported his preceptor said: 'This is the state of difference after union (*farq bād l-jam'*). This was the beginning of Sirhindī's experience of difference; as he advanced the experience deepened till it became absolute. His earliest vision in which he saw 'every particle of his being nothing but God', was replaced by a vision in which he saw 'God with all the particles of his being rather than it'. Next he saw God 'neither one with the world nor different from it, neither in it nor outside it'. The view which he earlier had of God's co-existence (*ma'iyah*), comprehension (*iḥāyah*) and immanence (*sīryān*) disappeared altogether. He could not, however, still conceive God without them. But later on that feeling, too, disappeared, and he saw that 'God stood with the world in a relation different from those relations. It was an incomprehensible relation. However, it, too, disappeared finally, and Sirhindī saw that 'God had no relation at all with the world, neither knowable nor unknowable'. 'I was given', he says, 'a special

knowledge according to which there existed no relation between God and the world, though I saw both of them. At this time I was informed that the object of my vision (*mashhūd*), in spite of its transcendental character, was not God. It was rather the symbolic form of God's creative relation'. This is how Sirhindī was gradually led to the experience of God's complete otherness and absolute transcendence.

This is indeed a great experience. But it is by no means unique. Sirhindī believes that other Sufis have also had it, though few have cared to describe it. If one says that it is rather presumptuous, as there are no records to support this claim, Sirhindī would say that the lack of records is no proof that the other Sufis did not have the experience. The absence of records is not at all surprising, for Sufis who reach the end of their journey do not usually speak of their experience. Abu Yazid testifies to this view when he says: 'The man who comes to know God is stunned; he is not spared to speak.'<sup>30</sup> Only they talk loud who have not yet come out of the intoxication of the unitive experience.

Reports of the experience of complete difference and transcendence are, however, not rare. 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmi (d. 898/1493) has preserved a letter which the great Persian Sufi, 'Alā' l-Dawlah Simmāni<sup>31</sup> (d. 736/1336) wrote to 'Abd 'l-Razzāq Kāshī<sup>32</sup> (d. 730/1329) in which he recounts the stages of his experience very similar to those of Sirhindī. He writes:

In the beginning of my career I passed some days in the state which the quatrain of Kayshī describes, and very much enjoyed it. [The quatrain referred to is:

Every form that appears on the plank of existence  
Is the form of the One who makes that form  
When an old river produces a new wave  
It is in fact the river, though they call it a wave.]

But I left it behind. I mean to say that when I crossed the initial and the middle stages of *mukāshafah* and reached the end, I discovered the error of the earlier *mukāshafah*. I was completely convinced of the new enlightenment and entertained no doubt about it. . .

In the middle stage of the *mukâshafah* truths very similar to those which the quatrain of Kayshi mentions were revealed to me. I saw God in the form of an ocean bursting into waves, keeping some of them and destroying others. There were circles of creatures, large and small, some of them were happy: they displayed the mercy of God in varying degrees according to the expanse of their circles and their righteousness. Others were unhappy: they showed the wrath of God in varying degrees according to the narrowness of their circles and their wickedness. The ocean as sustainer was sustaining some, and as destroyer was destroying others, and as producer of waves was creating new waves.

But when I reached the final *mukâshafah*, the wind of absolute certainty (*haqq* 'l-*yaqin*) blew and destroyed all the ideas that blossomed forth in the initial and middle stages. . . O dear! true faith corresponds with reality and agrees with the Sharî'ah. You have the certitude of belief (*ilm* 'l-*yaqin*) at the initial stage of the *mukâshafah*, certitude of vision ('ayn 'l-*yaqin*) at the middle stage of the *mukâshafah*, and true certitude (*haqq* 'l-*yaqin*) at the final stage of the *mukâshafah*. True certitude has been called simply certitude by God: 'Serve your Lord till you get certitude',<sup>53</sup> and is available only at the last stage of the *mukâshafah*. Whoever reaches this stage nothing that he says differs from reality. The author of the *Manâzil* 'l-Sâ'irîn<sup>54</sup> believed that *tawhîd* is the last stage of the mystic. This is not true. He stopped at the eightieth step. The hundredth step of the mystic is servanthood (*al-ubûdiyah*); that is, the return of the servant to his original state by way of *wâliyat* enjoying the revelation of God without losing one's reason. Junayd was asked: 'What is the end of this affair?'. He replied: 'Return to the beginning'.<sup>55</sup>

From this account it is clear that Simnâni's first experience was an experience of unity. He saw God as one ocean and the world as waves appearing and disappearing in the ocean. This is the common image in which mystics perceive unity and which they employ in order to convey that idea as the quatrain of Kayshi does. Simnâni indicates that when he had this vision he was quite sure of its truth: he had a certitude which a vision offers ('ayn 'l-*yaqin*). But when he advanced he had a new vision which replaced his earlier vision. He now realised that man is only a servant of God,

and that servanthood, rather than the ecstatic experience of oneness with God (*tawhîd*) is the final stage of the mystic. At this stage he got the true certitude (*haqq* 'l-*yaqin*) which blew away the ideas of his earlier vision.

Although Simnâni does not describe at length his last experience as Sirhindî does, the words by which he refers to it – 'servanthood' and 'return to the beginning' – make it quite clear that he means the experience of absolute difference. This is further supported by his strong rejection of *wâhdat* 'l-wujûd and clear affirmation of God's absolute transcendence in his book, *al-'Urwah li Ahl 'l-Khalwah*.<sup>56</sup> Few Sufis have cared to report their experience of absolute difference; accounts like that of Sirhindî and Simnâni are not easy to find. But the words which they have used to characterise their experiences, or similar phrases can be easily multiplied. Simnâni himself refers to the words of Junayd, the recognised leader of the Sufi community (*Sayyida l-Tâ'ifah*). This undoubtedly the most outstanding figure among the early Sufis has been studied by a couple of scholars. I have also discussed him in a separate paper. We all<sup>57</sup> agree that Junayd is a firm believer in God's complete transcendence, a belief which is epitomised in his famous words: 'Tawhîd is the complete separation of the contingent from the Necessary'.<sup>58</sup>

The *sulûk* of the Sufi is a movement from difference to difference by the way of union, the reappropriation of servanthood through the Sufi way of *fânâ* and *baqâ*, that is, *wâliyat*, as Simnâni says, or the return to the beginning as Junayd says. Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Qâdir 'l-Filâni reiterates in his own way this truth when he describes the beginning and the end of the Sufi in these words: 'The beginning is to discard the normal life (*al-mâ'hûd*), and to follow the Divine Command (*al-mashrû'*), then to see things determined by the Eternal Will (*al-naqdûr*), and finally to return to the normal (*al-mâ'hûd*) with the condition that you observe the limits (*hudûd*) of the Sharî'ah'.<sup>59</sup>

To be sure, *tawhîd* understood in the sense of realisation of oneness with God has been regarded by many Sufis as the ultimate stage of Sufism. It is certainly the view of Shaykh Ibn 'l-'Arabî, Shaykh 'Abdullah 'l-Ansâri, the author of

*Manāzil i-Sā’irin* and ‘Abd 1-Rahmān Jāmī.<sup>60</sup> But the other view, that *tawhīd* is only a stage of the Sufi *sulūk* and that the final stage is servanthood (*ubūdiyah*), and the ultimate truth is difference rather than oneness has been maintained by many more eminent Sufis like Junayd, ‘Abd 1-Qādir 1-Jilāmī, Shihāb 1-Dīn 1-Suhrawardi, Bahā’ 1-Dīn Naqshband, ‘Alā’ 1-Dawlah Simmānī, and Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī.

### Characteristics of the Unitive Experience

The experiences of unity and difference are correlated with different kinds of beliefs, attitudes, affective states and patterns of behaviour. Many Sufis have been aware of this fact, and at times referred to one or the other aspect of it. But a full perception of that correlation and its uninhibited discussion had to wait for Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī.

Sirhindī calls the unitive state ‘*kufr-i-tarīqah*’, and the state of difference ‘*Islām-i-tarīqah*’. The reason for calling the unitive experience *kufr* of the *tarīqah* is that it hides (*kafara* literally means to hide) the difference between God and the world, between the Lord and the servant, between good and evil, between faith and infidelity, which the Shari‘ah of the Prophet affirms. The experience of difference, on the other hand, underlines these differences and therefore deserves the name ‘*Islām* of the *tarīqah*’. Sirhindī explains the concept of *kufr-i-tarīqah* in these words:

The *kufr-i-tarīqah* is the state of union (*magām-i-jam*) in which reality is hidden, and distinctions between truth and untruth disappear. In this state the mystic beholds in the mirror of everything, good and evil, the beauty of the One he loves. He does not see, therefore, anything, good or evil, perfect or imperfect, except as a manifestation of that Unity. Hence, he loses the will to denounce (evil and untruth) which arises from the distinction between them; consequently, he is at peace with everything, all of which he finds on the right path. He draws pleasure from the verse of the Qur’ān: ‘There is not a moving creature, but He holds it by its fore-lock. Verily my Lord is on a straight path.’<sup>61</sup> He identifies the object of manifestation with the Manifesting Being, the world

with God, and the servant with the Lord. These are the consequences of the unitive experience. It was in this state that Mansūr said:

I disbelieve (*kafartu*) in the religion of God,  
And I must disbelieve, even though  
Disbelief (*kufr*) may be a bugbear to the Muslims.<sup>62</sup>

That the experience of unity conceals the truth of difference and thus conflicts with the Shari‘ah which affirms it has been widely recognised by the Sufis. Wali Allāh’s description of the unitive experience under the name of *wahdat i-wujūd*, which I have quoted earlier, is one instance. The saying common in the Sufi literature that ‘union (*al-jam*) without separation (*tafrīqah*) is blasphemy (*zandaqah*)’<sup>63</sup> is a recognition of the same truth. Sirhindī’s couplet which Sirhindī has quoted is a further instance. For what Mansūr means by saying that he disbelieves in the religion of God is that he does not recognise the difference which Islam upholds between God and the world. Obviously he does not mean to say that he repudiates the Shari‘ah of the Prophet. It is well known that he continued to observe the duties of the Shari‘ah till the end of his life; Sirhindī says that Mansūr ‘offered four hundred *rak’āt* of prayer every day in prison (before he was hanged) and refused to eat the food which was given to him by unjust hands’.<sup>64</sup>

Sirhindī lists three consequences of the unitive experience: First, to believe that whatever is in existence is good and fail to perceive any real difference between good and evil; second, to believe that every faith and religion is right, and refuse, on that account, to criticise any belief or practice; and third, to identify oneself with God and believe that all is One. That these are the consequences of the unitive experience is fully attested by everyone who has had that experience and given vent to his feelings and ideas. The most outstanding examples are Ibn 1-Fāriḍ<sup>65</sup> (d. 632/1235) and Mansūr 1-Hallāj<sup>66</sup> (d. 309/922) in Arabic, and Jalāl 1-Dīn Rūmī<sup>67</sup> (d. 672/1273) and Farid 1-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār<sup>68</sup> (d. 628/1230) in Persian. They are the untiring singers of unity and identity, the intoxicated lovers of One-in-all Beauty and the supreme preachers of ‘all is good’. Their songs are too well-known to

be cited here. At the sophisticated level of philosophy, the doctrines of Ibn 'l-'Arabī which deny the objectivity of evil, relativise faith, condone erroneous beliefs and excuse misdeeds, explain away punishment and make hell<sup>68</sup> appear as another paradise, are the fruits of the same experience.

Unitive experience does not affect only beliefs and attitudes, but also practices. Quite often Sufis feel a conflict between their experience and the injunctions of the *Shar'*. However, those whom God saves avoid their violation. Abū Bakr 'l-Shiblī, for instance, once stood for *salāt*, but refrained from it, and remained in that state for a while, then did it. When he finished he said: 'Alas! if I pray, I deny; but if I do not pray, I become an infidel.'<sup>70</sup> What al-Shiblī means is that if he prays he affirms the difference between the Lord and the servant and thus denies unity; but on the other hand, if he does not offer prayer, he disobeys God and commits an act of infidelity. On another occasion he made the call (*adhān*) for *salāt*. When he finished the two *shahādah*, (the profession of the unity of God, and the prophecy of Muhammad) he addressed God and said: 'If You had not ordered what I have said I would not have mentioned any name along with Yours.'<sup>71</sup>

Al-Shiblī only voiced the contradiction between his experience and the Shari'ah, but he neither disparaged the Shari'ah nor violated its commands. Others have not exercised that restraint. Shaykh Muḥammad Shatṭārī a sixteenth-century Indian Sufi dubs the Shari'ah as a veil: 'Knowledge', he says, 'is a great veil, I mean the knowledge to serve God ('ubūdiyah) is a big veil. If that veil is removed from between, *kufir* becomes one with Islam, and Islam becomes one with *kufir*, and the worship of God and obedience to His command goes away.'<sup>72</sup> Instances of violation of the Shari'ah in practice by Sufis under the influence of the unitive experience are rare. Those who have actually violated the Shari'ah and committed sins are rather imposters, who use the name of the experience to justify their evil deeds.

*Shaiħ*, or words uttered in an ecstatic state in which the Sufi boasts of superhuman power or status is the second thing which Sirhindī associates with the unitive experience. 'Shaiħā' like "I am God", "Glory to me", "There is nothing

in the cloak except God", are the fruits', he says, 'of the tree of union (*jam'*) which come from an overpowering and intoxicating love of God that throws everything out of sight and leaves nothing in the vision of the mystic except his Beloved'.<sup>73</sup>

The first Sufi to discuss the phenomenon of *shaiħ* was Abū Nasr 'l-Sarrāj (d. 378/988). He says that the Sufis indulge in *shaiħ* under the influence of a powerful ecstatic experience that produces intense excitement, suppresses reason and removes control over language. What they say is not without truth, but the language which they use is misleading and shocking.<sup>74</sup> He reviews at length the *shaiħāt* of Abū Yazid, al-Shiblī, al-Nūrī and Abū Hāmzah and bases his discussion, particularly of Abū Yazid, on the Commentary<sup>75</sup> which Junayd wrote on the latter's *shaiħāt*. He quotes with approval Junayd's remark: 'In spite of the great experiences he had and the sublime words he spoke, Abū Yazid does not seem to have crossed the first stage. I have not heard words that show that he reached the end and attained perfection.'<sup>76</sup> Since by the first stage Junayd means the unitive stage,<sup>77</sup> statement is confirmation of the fact that *shaiħ* is the result of the unitive experience. Al-Sarrāj reiterates the truth he says: 'Shaiħ is hardly found in the case of perfection.'

The other Sufi who took up the subject in Sirhindī. In his treatment the connotation of extended; *shaiħ* means not only the words<sup>78</sup> 'Sufi identifies himself with God or deifies'<sup>79</sup> those words which suggest any kind of 'Shari'ah under the impact of the unitive summarise below various kinds of *shaiħ* discussed.

The first category of *shaiħ* consists of words like 'I am God', 'Glory to me', 'except God', and 'I am the P' Sufi identifies himself with 'Shirīn' mayād<sup>80</sup> or 'use stalked am so his Sirīn' mayād<sup>81</sup> and 'not have. ways of obnoxious not toying and serving' said: 'He which Junayd takes' 'The second categ-

'Beloved'.<sup>73</sup>

The first Sufi to discuss the phenomenon of *shaiħ* was Abū Nasr 'l-Sarrāj (d. 378/988). He says that the Sufis indulge in *shaiħ* under the influence of a powerful ecstatic experience that produces intense excitement, suppresses reason and removes control over language. What they say is not without truth, but the language which they use is misleading and shocking.<sup>74</sup> He reviews at length the *shaiħāt* of Abū Yazid, al-Shiblī, al-Nūrī and Abū Hāmzah and bases his discussion, particularly of Abū Yazid, on the Commentary<sup>75</sup> which Junayd wrote on the latter's *shaiħāt*. He quotes with approval Junayd's remark: 'In spite of the great experiences he had and the sublime words he spoke, Abū Yazid does not seem to have crossed the first stage. I have not heard words that show that he reached the end and attained perfection.'<sup>76</sup> Since by the first stage Junayd means the unitive stage,<sup>77</sup> statement is confirmation of the fact that *shaiħ* is the result of the unitive experience. Al-Sarrāj reiterates the truth he says: 'Shaiħ is hardly found in the case of perfection.'

The other Sufi who took up the subject in Sirhindī. In his treatment the connotation of extended; *shaiħ* means not only the words<sup>78</sup> 'Sufi identifies himself with God or deifies'<sup>79</sup> those words which suggest any kind of 'Shari'ah under the impact of the unitive summarise below various kinds of *shaiħ* discussed.

The first category of *shaiħ* consists of words like 'I am God', 'Glory to me', 'except God', and 'I am the P' Sufi identifies himself with 'Shirīn' mayād<sup>80</sup> or 'use stalked am so his Sirīn' mayād<sup>81</sup> and 'not have. ways of obnoxious not toying and serving' said: 'He which Junayd takes' 'The second categ-

be cited here. At the sophisticated level of philosophy, the doctrines of Ibn 1-‘Arabī which deny the objectivity of evil, relativise faith, condone erroneous beliefs and excuse misdeeds, explain away punishment and make hell<sup>69</sup> appear as another paradise, are the fruits of the same experience.

Unitive experience does not affect only beliefs and attitudes, but also practices. Quite often Sufis feel a conflict between their experience and the injunctions of the *Sharī’ah*. However, those whom God saves avoid their violation. Abū Bakr 1-Shiblī, for instance, once stood for *ṣalāt*, but refrained from it, and remained in that state for a while, then did it. When he finished he said: ‘Alas! if I pray, I deny; but if I do not pray, I become an infidel.’<sup>70</sup> What al-Shiblī means is that if he prays he affirms the difference between the Lord and the servant and thus denies unity; but on the other hand, if he does not offer prayer, he disobeys God and commits an act of infidelity. On another occasion he made the call (*adhnān*) for *ṣalāt*. When he finished the two *shahādah*, (the profession of the unity of God, and the prophecy of Muhammad) he addressed God and said: ‘If You had not ordered what I have said I would not have mentioned any name along with Yours.’<sup>71</sup>

Al-Shiblī only voiced the contradiction between his experience and the *Shari’ah*, but he neither disparaged the *Shari’ah* nor violated its commands. Others have not exercised that restraint. Shaykh Muḥammad Shāfiṭārī a sixteenth-century Indian Sufi dubs the *Shari’ah* as a veil: ‘Knowledge’, he says, ‘is a great veil, I mean the knowledge to serve God (*‘ubūdiyah*) is a big veil. If that veil is removed from between, *kuff* becomes one with Islam, and Islam becomes one with *kuff*, and the worship of God and obedience to His command goes away.’<sup>72</sup> Instances of violation of the *Shari’ah* in practice by Sufis under the influence of the unitive experience are rare. Those who have actually violated the *Shari’ah* and committed sins are rather imposters, who use the name of the experience to justify their evil deeds.

*Shāfi*, or words uttered in an ecstatic state in which the Sufi boasts of superhuman power or status is the second thing which Sirhindī associates with the unitive experience. ‘*Shāfi* like ‘I am God’, ‘Glory to me’, ‘There is nothing

in the cloak except God’, are the fruits’ he says, ‘of the tree of union (*jām*) which come from an overpowering and intoxicating love of God that throws everything out of sight and leaves nothing in the vision of the mystic except his Beloved’.<sup>73</sup>

The first Sufi to discuss the phenomenon of *shāfi* was Abū Nasr 1-Sarrāj (d. 378/988). He says that the Sufis indulge in *shāfi*, under the influence of a powerful ecstatic experience that produces intense excitement, suppresses reason and removes control over language. What they say is not without truth, but the language which they use is misleading and shocking.<sup>74</sup> He reviews at length the *shāfiyat* of Abū Yazid, al-Shiblī, al-Nūri and Abū Hamzah and bases his discussion, particularly of Abū Yazid, on the Commentary<sup>75</sup> which Junayd wrote on the latter’s *shāfiyat*. He quotes with approval Junayd’s remark: ‘In spite of the great experiences he had and the sublime words he spoke, Abū Yazid does not seem to have crossed the first stage. I have not heard words that show that he reached the end and attained perfection.’<sup>76</sup> Since by the first stage Junayd means the unitive stage, his statement is confirmation of the fact that *shāfi* is the result of the unitive experience. Al-Sarrāj reiterates the truth when he says: ‘*Shāfi* is hardly found in the case of perfect men.’<sup>77</sup>

The other Sufi who took up the subject in detail was Sirhindī. In his treatment the connotation of the word is extended; *shāfi* means not only the words with which the Sufi identifies himself with God or deifies himself, but also those words which suggest any kind of deviation from the *Shari’ah* under the impact of the unitive experience. I will summarise below various kinds of *shāfi* which Sirhindī has discussed.

The first category of *shāfi* consists, of course, of words like ‘I am God’, ‘Glory to me’, ‘There is none in my cloak except God’, and ‘I am the Preserved Tablet’, in which the Sufi identifies himself with God or any of His powers. Sirhindī takes these words as a description of the experiences which their sayers had, what they saw or felt. He does not take them as a statement of reality.<sup>78</sup> This is the same position which Junayd takes in interpreting Abū Yazid’s *shāfiyat*.

The second category consists of *shāfi* which are appa-

rently false and shocking, but if one interprets them properly one will find them to be true. An instance is: 'The inclusiveness (*jam'*) of Muhammad is more inclusive than the inclusiveness of God.' What these words mean, Sirhindī says, is that Muhammad combines in himself both the levels of reality, the possible and the necessary, and is therefore more comprehensive than God, the Necessary Being. But there is a subtle point here, which, Sirhindī says, should not escape our notice. Muhammad combines a symbolic presentation of the Necessary rather than His reality. Unless this qualification is made the statement would not be true. Muhammad is but a creature, limited and finite; whereas God is limitless and infinite.<sup>79</sup>

The third category consists of *shāthāt* which are totally false; however you interpret them you cannot make them true. This is the case with Abū Yāzid's words: 'My banner is higher than the banner of Muḥammad.' By his banner of Abū Yāzid means sainthood (*walāyah*) and by the banner of Muḥammad he means prophecy (*nubūwah*). What he means is that *walāyah* is superior to *nubūwah*. Some understand this statement to say that the *walāyah* of a wali is superior to the *nubūwah* of a prophet; others interpret it to mean that the *walāyah* of a prophet, not of a wali, is superior to his *nubūwah*. Sirhindī shows at length that the statement is false however we interpret it. The *nubūwah* of a prophet is superior to any *walāyah*, be it the *walāyah* of a prophet or a wali.<sup>80</sup>

The fourth category consists of *shāthāt* which are the result of an excessive absorption of the mystic in God to the neglect of the other obligations of the *Shar'*. A case in point is the statement of Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-Kharqānī<sup>81</sup> (d. 425/1034): 'I am still occupied with God, and I feel ashamed that I have not moved to the obedience of the Prophet.' These words, Sirhindī points out, differentiate between obedience to God and obedience to the Prophet, and presume that there are ways to obey God and to be occupied with Him which are not shown by the Prophet, or that one can obey God without obeying the Prophet. But this is wrong; the proper way to serve God is through the obedience of the Prophet.<sup>82</sup> Some words are called *shāthāt*, but they are not *shāthāt*.

People call them *shāthāt*, for they want to protect their speaker from reproach. They do not realise that *shāthāt* is the result of intoxication (*sukr*) caused by an ecstatic experience. But statements made after calm deliberation that contradict the *Shar'* are not *shāthāt*. For example, Shaykh Kabīr Yamānī's statement: 'God does not know the hidden (*ghayb*)' is not a *shāthāt*. This is a deliberate statement flatly contradicting the words of the Qur'ān: 'Verily, God knows the hidden (*al-ghayb*) and the manifest (*al-shāhādah*).'<sup>83</sup> It must be censured and condemned. The Shaykh 'cannot exonerate himself of the offensiveness of his words by giving a different meaning to *ghayb*. If he wanted to say something different he should have chosen a different word. Nothing can justify a language which borders on infidelity'.<sup>84</sup>

The third thing which Sirhindī associates with the unitive experience is what is called *sukr* or *ghaybah*. The unitive experience is an ecstatic experience in which reason is completely suppressed. Although the real experience is short-lived and soon passes off, it leaves an effect on the Sufi which is very much like the intoxication (*sukr*) caused by drinking. Some Sufis recover from intoxication quickly and become sober; others take hours, days, even months to regain their normal state. The intensity of intoxication varies from Sufi to Sufi: some may not eat, drink or sleep; others may do all these things, but remain unconscious of what goes on around them. Those who are protected (*mahfūz*), perform daily prayers and avoid sin. The following two instances will give an idea of the state. Al-Shiblī once came to Junayd who was sitting with his wife. Seeing al-Shiblī she was going to leave. But Junayd told her that she should stay because al-Shiblī was not conscious of his actions. Junayd then talked to al-Shiblī till the latter started weeping and returned to his senses. At that moment Junayd asked his wife to leave.<sup>84</sup> The other is the case of al-Nūrī. Once in a meeting Junayd reported about him that he had been standing in the mosque of al-Shunayzī for many days, without eating, drinking and sleeping, saying only 'Allah, Allah', although he performed the prayers on time. Someone from the audience said: 'He is then sober (*sāhi*)'. Junayd observed: 'No; ecstatic people are taken care of by God in their state of ecstasy.'<sup>85</sup>

It is not surprising that a Sufi under intoxication extols it over sobriety (*sahw*). Mansūr, who in the view of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir<sup>86</sup> and Shaykh Sirhindī<sup>87</sup> did not move up from the unitive stage could not but glorify it. He entered into an argument with Junayd and was unable to agree with the latter’s view that sobriety rather than intoxication was the condition of the perfect Sufis.<sup>88</sup> Bisṭāmīs have also been said to have extolled *sukr* over *sahw*. Their views seem to have been influenced by the reports of what Junayd calls the first period of their leader, Abū Yazid al-Bistāmī. As Abū Yazid came out of the unitive stage very late in his life, reports about his experience of separation and his sobriety did not circulate<sup>89</sup> much, consequently he continued to be identified with his earlier views.

#### Characteristics of the Experience of Difference

When the Sufi crosses the stage of union and enters into the stage of separation, differences reappear. He differentiates between God and the world, and between the Lord and the servant. He distinguishes between good and evil, between faith and infidelity, and between sin and obedience. He praises the one and condemns the other, warns people against wrong beliefs and evil practices, and calls them to true faith and good conduct as the prophets have defined. This is the stage of *Islam-i-tariqat*. Sirhindī writes: ‘The Islam of *tariqah* is the experience of difference after union wherein distinctions come back and truth is separated from untruth, and good from evil.’<sup>90</sup>

As noted before, the experience of difference is a matter of degree. At the lowest stage, the Sufi begins to see the distinctions but is not able to clearly separate God from the world, good from evil and truth from untruth. He affirms their identity as well as difference. He believes that their difference is grounded in an essential unity, and thinks that the transcendence of God emerges out of an ultimate Unity. But when he moves ahead, the experience of difference intensifies, and as he reaches the end of the road, he sees that the truth is not that God is essentially one with the world, but that He is completely other and absolutely

different, that there is nothing in common between God and the world. God is beyond our idea of ‘beyond’ (*warā* ‘l-warā’). To the extent a Sufi comes close to this goal, he is free from the intoxicating influence of his unitive experience, is sober and calm, recovers his discretion and regains control over language. He does not indulge in *shāth*, and makes no claims; he is humble and submissive, lives in awe and fear, is ashamed of his earlier impudence and turns to God for forgiveness. He does not feel the conflict between his experience and the *Sharī’ah*, says nothing that conflicts with the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and is not irreverent and impolite. His practice does not differ from the *Sharī’ah*, and his ideals are governed by the example of the Prophet. Sirhindī notes that this is a matter of degree: unless one reaches the end and affirms God’s complete transcendence one is not completely free from intoxication, and his ideas and practices are not in full agreement with the *Sharī’ah*.<sup>91</sup>

This view of the Sufi life at its perfection can be fully substantiated from Sufi literature. I have, however, space only for a few citations. ‘*Tasawwuf* is like plenury: you talk nonsense (*hidhyān*) at first, but when you are established you become quiet’ (*‘Abdullāh al-Nibājī*).<sup>92</sup> ‘When Sufis know God really they do not speak loud, and when they become silent they find peace in God’ (Abū Yazid).<sup>93</sup> ‘They seek ecstasy so long as they are happy with it. But when they come in the presence of God ecstasy vanishes’ (Junayd).<sup>94</sup> ‘The closer you reach God the more you fear Him’ (Dhu’l-Nūn).<sup>95</sup> ‘*Shāth* is a lapse on the part of an advanced Sufi (Ibn ‘l-Arabi).<sup>96</sup> ‘When Sufis reach the end they seek only one thing: forgiveness’ (Abū Yazid).<sup>97</sup> ‘The Sufi who reaches the end lives like the Prophet and calls people to God’ (Suhrawardi).<sup>98</sup>

#### Status of the Unitive Experience

What does the unitive experience really mean? What is its nature and status? On this question the Sufis are broadly divided into three groups. One group simply recounts the experience, and says nothing as to what it means to them. They concern themselves with description, and do not

indulge in reflection. They have no doctrine about the nature of the experience and no observation on its status. The outstanding figure in this group is Abū Yazid. He describes quite clearly various levels of his experience – *fānā*, *baqā* and complete immersion into pure unity. For instance, he says: ‘God veiled me through me so I died, then He veiled me through Him so I lived, then He veiled me from me and from Him so I went into an “unconsciousness” (*ghaybah*).’<sup>99</sup> He also tells of various characteristics of the experience which have been noted by many scholars of mysticism. He says that he is not conscious of time, of day and night; that he flies to eternity.<sup>100</sup> He is also not conscious of space; he feels that he is a vast ocean which has no end.<sup>101</sup> He ceases to be conscious of his human attributes, and says that he has no attributes.<sup>102</sup> He underlines the ecstatic nature of the experience when he says that God united him with Himself but inflamed<sup>103</sup> him, and that he lost his reason.<sup>104</sup> His observers say that in that state Abū Yazid was easily provoked to wild claims and defamatory statements (*shāthāt*).<sup>105</sup> Abū Yazid gives all this information about his experience, but never does he say a word as to what the experience means to him, or how he takes it. Those who have called him a pantheist attribute a philosophical position to a person who contents himself to narrating his experiences and avoids taking positions.

The second group of Sufis claim that they realise in the experience their essential unity with God. In the ordinary life they forget that fact and believe that they are different from God. They recapture that truth in the unitive experience, which is not negated, they believe, by their post-union separation. That experience only brings to light the relative difference between God and man which is overshadowed in the unitive experience. What is the nature of the essential unity, how does man differ from God and how does the world of plurality proceed from unity? Not all Sufis have answered these questions, and those who have, have given different answers. Ibn ’l-’Arabi’s answer is one. He says that the unity revealed in the unitive experience is the unity of Being (*wujūd*), that man and other objects of the world are particular determinations (*la’ayyunāt*) of One Being, and

that the plurality proceeds from Unity by a process of manifestation (*tajallī*). The way Ibn ’l-’Arabi defines these key concepts and works them out in detail gives a particular shape to his philosophy. Others have conceived them differently and have come out with different philosophies. They however agree on the point that the unitive experience is a real experience.

The third group of Sufis believe that the experience of union or oneness is only a matter of vision (*shuhūdī*) not of reality (*‘aynī*). The mystic perceives that he is one with God, but he is not one with God. This is the view of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī and ‘Alā’ ’l-Dawlah Ṣimnānī. Shaykh Ahmad writes:

*Fānā*’ and *baqā*’ are perceptual (*shuhūdī*) not existential (*wujūdī*). Man does not become God and is not united with God. The servant is servant for ever, and the Lord is Lord eternally. They are wicked heretics who think that *fānā*’ and *baqā*’ are existential; that man discards his ontological limitations and unites with his Primal Source, Who is free from all limitation and determination; that he annihilates and lives in his Lord; or that like a drop of water which loses itself and mingles in the river, he casts away his individual limitations and becomes one with the Absolute. May God save us from these blasphemous ideas.<sup>106</sup>

What the Sufi unites with, Sirhindī further observes, is not God; it is only a shadow (*zill*) of God, other than God (*ghayr Allāh*) and a mere creature (*makhlūq*) of God. This is true of the forms and lights he sees, and the voices he hears. Sirhindī quotes the words of Khwājah Bahā ’l-Dīn Naqshband: ‘Whatever is seen, heard or experienced is other than God, and must be negated by the word (*kalimah*) of negation (i.e. *lā ilāha illā Allāh*: there is no god except Allah).’<sup>107</sup>

The view which Sirhindī takes of the status of forms and lights which Sufis see is the view many other Sufis have also held. Al-Sarrāj, for instance, writes:

It should be noted that every light which eyes behold is something created (*makhlūq*). There is nothing common between it and God; it is not an attribute of God at all; it is entirely a created object.<sup>108</sup>

For Sirhindi the knowledge which the experience of union is supposed to impart is not knowledge at all. To a disciple who had got the vision of unity in multiplicity, he sent this instruction:

You must pass over these states and stations, and try to reach the One who produces those states, and where there is no knowledge but ignorance . . . Negate all that comes to you in vision and understanding, even if it is the vision of unity in multiplicity. For the real Unity does not appear in multiplicity; what actually appears is a reflection or an image of that Unity, not the Unity itself . . . Repeat the words: *Lâ ilâha illâ Allâh* . . . till nothing is left in vision or in knowledge, till you come to wonder (*hayrah*) and unknowing (*jâhâ*) and attain annihilation (*fâni*). Unless you reach wonder and unknowing, you will not attain annihilation . . . Do not think of arrival (*wâṣîl*) or meeting (*ittîqâ*); that is not yet in sight.<sup>109</sup>

It is not knowledge, but wonder that marks the final stage of the Sufi. He comes to know not that he knows God, but that he does not know and cannot know God. True knowledge of God, therefore, is to realise that one cannot know God. Abû Bakr 'I-Siddiq put it in this way: 'Glorified is He who does not make Himself known except in our realisation that we cannot know Him.'<sup>110</sup> Dhû 'I-Nûn said: 'Those who know God best wonder in Him most.'<sup>111</sup>

#### Purpose of *Fâni*' and *Baqâ'*

The experience of *fâni*' and *baqâ'* is not a participation in the Divine life. When the Sufi annihilates himself and unites with God, that happens at a level not different from a dream; it is not the level of reality. If in a dream you see, Sirhindi says, that you are king you do not become king. Similarly when a mystic sees that he is one with God, he is not one with God.<sup>112</sup> When he sees that he transcends time and space, that he moves in eternity and is infinite, that he is the hand of God, or His knowledge, or that he is God, he is, in fact, none of these things. These experiences are no more real than a dream.

This view of the experience which Sirhindi holds has been corroborated by a number of Sufis. I have already quoted the words of Khwâjâ Bahâ' 'I-Dîn Naqshband that 'all that is seen, heard or experienced is other than God and must be negated'. Al-Ghazâlî has the same view. Commenting on the words of Abû 'I-Qâsim Gurgânî<sup>113</sup> (d. 465/1072) that in the ultimate stage the attributes of God become the attributes of the mystic, he rejects<sup>114</sup> all possible interpretations which involve the deification of the mystic in any sense. He rejects that the mystic participates in the essence (*mâhiyah*) of the Divine attributes and becomes a Divine being like Him, or that the attributes of God flow into him, or that the mystic unites (*ittihâd*) with God, or that God enters into him (*hâhu*). Only one interpretation which he considers to be right is that the mystic leaves behind ignoble attributes that commonly characterise humanity and acquires the noble ones that resemble the ones which behave God. This resemblance, al-Ghazâlî further clarifies, is nothing more than a resemblance in name (*al-mushârakah fi 'iṣm*): the mystic never transcends human limitations and never becomes, for instance, omniscient. Al-Sarrâj,<sup>115</sup> al-Qushayrî<sup>116</sup> and Hujwîrî<sup>117</sup> have made the same points before. A number of modern scholars of Sufism have said that deification is the ultimate goal of Sufism. Professor Nicholson, for instance, writes: 'He who dies to his self lives in God, and *fâni*', the consummation of this death, marks the attainment of *baqâ'*, or union with the Divine life. Deification, in short, is the Muslim mystic's *ultima Thule*.'<sup>118</sup> If by deification Nicholson means any of the four things which al-Ghazâlî has rejected the statement is untrue. It is untrue in the view, besides al-Ghazâlî, of al-Sarrâj, al-Qushayrî, Hujwîrî, 'Abd 'I-Qâdir 'I-Jilâni, Shîhâb 'I-Dîn 'I-Suhrawardi, Bahâ' 'I-Dîn Naqshband and a host of other Sufis. If on the other hand, Nicholson means to say what al-Ghazâlî considers the right meaning of participation in God's attributes, then it is not deification at all. The statement has been actually prompted by the *shâthât* of Sufis such as 'Glory to me', and 'I am God', and becomes plausible if we suppose that those who uttered these words did not transcend the unitive stage and actually believed in the truth of what their

words apparently convey. But the sayer of the first *shāhī*, Abū Yāzid, went beyond the unitive stage, as we have noted before, affirmed the transcendence of God, and turned to Him for forgiveness.<sup>119</sup> The sayer of the second phrase, Mansūr, did most probably remain at the stage of union and died at that stage. Now suppose that he actually believed in what his words say, although there are reasons to doubt it, is Nicholson, on the basis of this phrase or the words of Sufis passing through the unitive stage like Mansūr, justified in making an unqualified statement about Sufism? Should he not consider that there is a stage, rather stages, beyond the stage of union, that a number of Sufis have really crossed the unitive stage, that *shāhī* is the sign of immaturity, that the perfect Sufi is sober rather than intoxicated, and meek rather than boastful. To make deification the end of Sufism is just like judging a city on the basis of its slums.

The experience of *fānā'* and *baqā'* gives no special knowledge which is not available from the Sharī'ah of the Prophet. Shaykh Bahā' ʻl-Dīn Naqshband was asked: 'What is the purpose of *sulūk*? He replied: 'The purpose is to know in detail what you know in brief, and to perceive in vision what you know through arguments.' Commenting on these words, Sirhindi says: 'The Shaykh did not say that the purpose is to acquire truths beyond the truths of the *Sharī'*. It is, however, a fact that the mystic receives different ideas during his *sulūk*. But when he reaches the end, these superfluous ideas disappear in the air. He then perceives the same truths of the *Sharī'* in detail, and comes out from the narrow enclosure of reason to the open space of *kashf*'<sup>120</sup>

The object of *sulūk*, Sirhindi says, is to produce conviction (*yaqīn*) in the truths of the *Sharī'*. 'One should not pursue *sulūk*', he says, 'in order to get something over and above the beliefs and practices of the *Sharī'*, or anything new. The purpose should be to acquire a conviction in the objects of faith that is not shaken by the doubts of a sceptic or jolted by the remarks of an objector.'<sup>121</sup> Sirhindi disparages very strongly transcendental visions and auditions. 'The object of the Sufi *sulūk*', he says, 'is not to view forms and images of transcendental realities, or behold colours and lights. In fact they are nothing more than play and fun . . . Forms, these

or others, and lights, physical or spiritual, are all created by God. He transcends them all, and they are nothing but His signs and proofs.'<sup>122</sup>

The other object of *sulūk* is to make observance of the Sharī'ah easy. 'Regarding the practices of the Sharī'ah', Sirhindi writes, 'the object is to make compliance to its rules easy and spontaneous, to remove sluggishness and eradicate the opposition of the carnal self (*nafs*)'.<sup>123</sup>

Sirhindi explains the relation of the Sufi *sulūk* to the Sharī'ah of the Prophet in this way: The Sharī'ah consists, he points out, of three parts: Knowledge ('ilm), practice ('amal) and *ikhlāṣ*, that is, to believe in the truths of the Sharī'ah and carry out its commands honestly and sincerely only to please God. The purpose of the Sufi exercise in *fānā'* and *baqā'* is neither to get new knowledge, nor to do some things not prescribed by the *Sharī'*, but to realise *ikhlāṣ*.<sup>124</sup> The Sufi goes through the experience of *fānā'* and *baqā'* so that he negates himself completely and lives just for the pleasure of God. The mystic *fānā'* and *baqā'* is a means, in other words, to this goal of selfless obedience to God which Sirhindi calls *fānā'-i-haqiqī*, or real *fānā'*. He writes: 'Real *fānā'* is effacing oneself in carrying out the will of God.<sup>125</sup> At another place he writes: 'Real *fānā'* is to forget the not-Divine, to free oneself from the love of the world, and to clean the heart from all desires and wishes, as it is required of a servant. And real *baqā'* is to fulfil the wishes of the Lord, to make His will one's own will without losing one's self-identity.'<sup>126</sup>

## Sufism and Shari‘ah

### Introduction

Scholars in modern times have viewed differently the relation of Sufism with Prophetic Islam. Some think that Sufism is an exotic growth and trace its various elements to one external source or the other. For instance, they trace its ascetic and monastic practices to Christianity; its exercise in self-annihilation (*fana*) to Buddhism; its aspiration to know transcendental realities through purification of the soul and illumination to gnosticism; its vision of the multiplicity proceeding from an ultimate unity to neo-Platonism; and its monistic theosophy to Indian Vedanta.<sup>1</sup>

Others have held a completely opposite view. For them Sufism is an essentially Islamic phenomenon, an authentic expression of the Islamic spirit. They point out that the abstinence and poverty which the Sufis practise are inspired by the life of the Prophet and his Companions; that their withdrawal from society is approved by the Shari‘ah as a measure to save themselves from the contagion of corruption and degeneration in government and society; that their occupation with devotion, *dhikr* and contemplation has been applauded by the Prophet; and that their theosophical vision, even the concepts of their philosophy of *wahdat i-wujūd*, are suggested by different Qur’ānic verses and ahādīth.<sup>2</sup>

Some scholars,<sup>3</sup> considering the complex nature of the phenomenon, have preferred to distinguish between a Sufism of poverty, renunciation and devotion, and a Sufism of love, ecstasy, *fana* and illumination; and attributed the former to Prophetic Islam and the latter to external influences. Others<sup>4</sup>

have differentiated between an orthodox Sufism (*al-tasawwuf* 'l-Sunnī) formulated, for instance, by al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), and a philosophical Sufism (*al-tasawwuf* 'l-falsafī), developed by Sufis like Ibn 'l-'Arabī (d. 638/1240). This division implies, in a sense, the idea that the former belongs to the heart of Islam, whereas the latter is somewhat foreign. Some other scholars<sup>5</sup> believe that Ibn 'l-'Arabī's Sufism is the true and real Sufism; and the Sufism of 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī (d. 561/1116), Shihāb 'l-Dīn 'l-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234) and perhaps al-Ghazzālī is a religious rather than a mystical enterprise.

Earliest Sufi writers like al-Sarrājī (d. 378/988), al-Kalābādhī (d. 390/1000), Abū Nu'aym (d. 430/1038) and al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072) claimed that Sufism was the most authentic expression of the inner dimension of Islam, and the most perfect realisation of its spiritual values.<sup>6</sup> They showed that the Sufis had the same beliefs as formulated by the theologians,<sup>7</sup> that they were governed by the same rules as were elaborated by the jurists, and that their methods and experiences were in complete agreement with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.<sup>8</sup> They interpreted and reconciled Sufi sayings which appeared to be inconsistent, and disowned those which were discordant.<sup>9</sup>

Al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) who appeared in the succeeding generation took a great step forward. Instead of interpreting Sufism and reconciling it with the Prophetic Islam, as his predecessors did, he interpreted the Prophetic religion itself in the light of Sufi ideas, experiences and practices, and demonstrated that Islam when properly understood was not different from Sufism as represented by its great masters. This is the task which he performed in the *Iḥyā* 'Ulūm 'l-Dīn.<sup>10</sup> The result was that Islam at its best was identified with Sufism. The work of 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī (d. 561/1166) and Shihāb 'l-Dīn 'l-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234), confirmed and strengthened this image. They, however, disassociated themselves from the speculative aspect of al-Ghazālī's work.<sup>11</sup> Ibn 'l-'Arabī (d. 638/1240) followed in al-Ghazālī's footsteps, and carried further the task of interpreting Islamic beliefs and practices in the light of Sufi experience and intuition.<sup>12</sup>

Partly because of these works, but more because of the enviable life of devotion and piety of its leaders in a situation which increasingly made the practice of earlier piety difficult, the belief that Islam at its best was one with Sufism was gradually established. If anyone, such as Ibn Taymiyah (d. 728/1327–8), tried to distinguish the Prophetic piety from Sufi piety, and criticise the Sufi ideas and ways that were incompatible with the Prophetic religion,<sup>13</sup> he was treated as an outsider, and his observations were ignored. Within the fold of Sufism there was no effort to examine the ways, ideals and concepts that had developed over centuries, and see how they stood with the basic approach of the Prophet and the fundamental principles of his religion. Of course, there are instances of self-criticism on matters of detail,<sup>14</sup> but we are not concerned with such things here.

### The Saintly Way and the Prophetic Way

Sirhindi was the first Sufi to look at the whole tradition of Sufism in the light of Prophetic Islam. He defined, on the one hand, the principles of the Prophet's religion, and stated, on the other, what was new in Sufism, and proceeded to show what part of it would fit into the Prophetic structure and serve its purpose, and what would not. He differentiated, to begin with, between the Prophet's way (*tariq-i-nubūwat*) to God, and the Sufi way (*tariq-i-walāyat*). Many Sufis before him had felt a conflict between the Sufi experience and Prophetic Islam, as we have noted before,<sup>15</sup> and some like al-Hallāj had expressed it very emphatically, but no one ever consciously admitted that the *tariqah* which produced the mystical experience was different from the Prophetic way. Sirhindi not only admitted the difference clearly, he also proceeded to spell it out in detail.

The most fundamental difference between the two ways is the experience of *fanā'* and *baqā'*. That experience is essential to the Sufi way, so much so that Sirhindi says '*walāyat* means *fanā'* and *baqā'* (*walāyat az fanā' wa baqā' ast*)'.<sup>16</sup> But neither this experience nor what leads to it, such as *jadhbah* and *suluk*,<sup>17</sup> are part of the Prophetic way. He writes:

The nearness to God (*qurb-i-lāhi*) which depends upon *fand* and *baqā'*, *sulūk* and *jadhbah*, is the saintly piety (*qurb-i-walāyat*), and the saints (*awliyā'*) of the Ummah have been graced with it. But the nearness to God (*qurb-i-lāhi*) which was given to the Companions of the Prophet in his company was the Prophetic piety (*qurb-i-nubūwat*) which they got through him and by following him. In this piety there is neither *fand*' nor *baqā'*, neither *jadhbah* nor *sulūk*. And this piety is many times superior to the saintly piety. For it is the real (*asīl*) piety, while the other is a second rate (*zillī*) piety.<sup>18</sup>

At another place Sirhindī discusses at length the difference between the two pieties, which may be summarised as follows:

*Fanā'*, which the saintly piety involves, means that the dualism (*iṭṭinayniyā'*) of man and God is to be abolished. But as the prophetic piety does not involve *fanā'*, it does not require the abolition of dualism; just the opposite, it maintains and preserves dualism.<sup>19</sup>

Since the Sufi seeks to remove dualism, he is always in a state of intoxication. But as the prophetic piety does not obliterate dualism, it does not know intoxication: it is complete sobriety (*sāḥw*).<sup>20</sup> We will appreciate this point if we recall that the Sufi *fanā'* is an ecstatic experience, achieved through intensifying passionate love ('ishq) and self-negating meditation. The Sufi is in an unusual state of mind before and after the experience; he is under intoxication. The prophetic way neither involves passionate love and self-negating meditation, nor ecstatic experience of union; hence it does not involve intoxication.

The Sufi love for God is a passionate love: it seeks to dissolve oneself and merge in God; and unless that happens the Sufi cries, weeps and sighs, and indulges in things which induce self-abandonment and ecstasy, such as music and dance. The prophetic love is a completely different love; it is unaware of the cries of separation, sighs for union, raptures and abandonment that characterise the former.<sup>21</sup>

Since *walāyat* requires the abolition of duality between man and God, the saint tries to negate his will, his attributes, and his personality. Sirhindī cites as example the words of Abū Yazid: 'I will not to will at all.'<sup>22</sup> Let me add to it the

words of Junayd: '*Tasqawwuf* is to eradicate natural dispositions, to wipe out human attributes, to uproot the urges of the self, and to promote the qualities of the spirit . . .'<sup>23</sup> In the prophetic way, as the goal is not to abolish duality, the traveller on this way does not have to negate his will, nor to eradicate his attributes and his self-hood. All that he has to do is to remove the evil objects of his will, and replace them by good objects. He has to do the same with his other attributes of knowledge and power. None of the attributes of man – knowledge, will and power etc – is evil in itself. On the contrary, they are good, and become evil when they are associated with evil objects. Therefore, all that is required is to replace evil objects by good ones. The prophets change the object of human attributes rather than eradicate the attributes themselves.<sup>24</sup>

Since the object of the Sufi *tarīqah*, the abolition of human attributes, is a very difficult task, the Sufi has to resort to extraordinary measures – severe penances, dangerous exercises, self-torture and mortification. Such measures are not required in the prophetic way; for it does not seek to abolish human attributes. Sirhindī cites his own experience. At first, he tried to abolish his will, but then gave up, when he realised that the purpose should be not to abolish the will, but the evil objects of the will. The prophetic way is easy, safe and sure; the Sufi way is difficult, dangerous and unsure; the former is the *rāh-i-iṭibā'* in which God leads his servant to Himself, the latter is the *rāh-i-inābat* in which the Sufi struggles to reach God.<sup>25</sup>

In the *walāyat* the Sufi has to wash his hands of this world and the next, and believe that to seek the next world (*ākhirah*) is no better than to seek this world. Sirhindī refers to the words of Dāwid 'l-Tā'ī<sup>26</sup> (d. 166/782): 'If you want safety, bid farewell to the world; but if you want honour, bid farewell to the Hereafter.' He also refers to the saying of Rābi'ah 'l-Adawiyyah<sup>27</sup> (d. 185/801) in which she opposes the love of Paradise to the Love of God and wishes to burn the Paradise. In the prophetic way, on the other hand, 'love of the next world has been praised, and the concern for the life hereafter is commended. Rather, the concern in this way means concern with the life hereafter, and love means love

of the next world'. The reason is that 'meeting with God is destined for the Hereafter, as the complete attainment of His pleasure (*riḍā*) will be available only there'. The travellers of the prophetic way know this truth; therefore, they do not oppose the love of Paradise to the love of God. But the travellers of the Sufi way do not realise this truth; consequently they imagine a contradiction between them.<sup>28</sup>

In *walāyat* the Sufi encounters appearances and illuminations (*zuhūrāt wa tajalliyat*). He sees forms and figures, colours and lights, particularly at the first stages of his *sulūk* and is happy with his visions. The traveller of the prophetic path sees hardly any visions, not even in the beginning of his career; and does not need them. For, these visions are nothing but shadows of the 'Real', and the traveller of the prophetic way 'has no love for shadows', and 'is not the captive of illumination (*tajalli*)'.<sup>29</sup>

This substantial and candid distinction between the Sufi way and the prophetic way coming from an eminent Sufi like Sirhindi was bound to affect the subsequent development of Sufism. One important effect was that more and more Sufis overcame their original reluctance and recognised that the two paths were different. They also increasingly felt the need to reform Sufism and bring it closer to the Shari'ah. I will dwell here on the former aspect only.

Wali Allāh, a century after Sirhindi, reiterated the difference between the Sufi way and the prophetic way. 'There are two ways', he said in his famous work *Hujjat Allāh 'l-Bālighah*, 'to attain happiness (*sa'adah*). One is the way of theistic philosophers (*al-muta'allihūn min 'l-hukamā'*) and God-intoxicated Sufis (*majdhub min 'l-sūfiyah*'); and the other is the way for which the prophets are sent'.<sup>30</sup> In a later work, *Hama'āt*, where he reviews the history of Sufism, he describes more clearly the difference between the saintly way and the prophetic way:

During the time of the Prophet and his Companions, even many generations later, people were primarily concerned with the commands of the *Shar'*; other things (i.e. feelings and sentiments) were associated with the carrying out of those commands. Their *rīsān* was prayer (*salāt*), fasting, *dhikr*, reading the Qur'ān, *hajj*, charity and *jihād*. None of them

ever spent an hour in meditation (*tajakkur*), or thought of a pure presence of God isolated from *dhikr* and other things, or tried to attain it. The best of them got pleasure in communion (*muṣājāt*) with God, in *salāt* and in *dhikr*; experienced an upsurge of feeling in reciting the Qur'ān; paid *zakāt* to avoid the displeasure of God, and to overcome greed and love for things other than God, and so on. None of them emitted a cry, went into ecstasy, behaved abnormally, or uttered *shāth*. No one knew the appearance (*tajalli*) of God, or His hiding (*istivār*) and things like that. They loved Paradise and feared Hell. Revelations (*kashf*) and miracles, ecstasies and trances are hardly reported of them; and if any of these things occurred to them it was accidental, never intended or deliberately cultivated. The conviction (*yaqīn*) which they had was the living consciousness of things in which they had faith. One of them said: 'The Doctor has made me sick.' It was like the vision or the insight which men ordinarily have. This was the condition of the people of this age.<sup>31</sup>

Shāh Wali Allāh confirms in this highly important statement most of the differences which Sirhindi has shown between the Sufi way and the Prophetic way. In the *Fuyūd 'l-Harāmayn*, which is a record of his meditations in the House of God at Makkah and the Mosque of the Prophet at Madinah, he makes this assessment of the Prophet's attitude to the Sufi way:

Regarding the second way of attaining to God my impression is that the Prophet did not have a good opinion about it, nor did he like it. His life symbolised the first way of approaching God. God has made him the source of the good which was to flow to people from this way and the means through which they acquired that good.<sup>32</sup>

The distinctions which Sirhindi and Wali Allāh have made between the prophetic way and the saintly way were further elaborated by Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>33</sup> (d. 1246/1830) in his work *Sirāti-Mustaqim*. He begins with a penetrating analysis of love, and shows how this central concept means one thing in the prophetic way and another in the Sufi way. He says that the Sufi love is a passionate love (*hubb-i-'ishqī*). It is born of a realisation on the part of the Sufi that his spirit is a Divine

spirit (*ruh-i-ilâhi*), that it is imprisoned in a material body, and that he would not be happy unless he frees it from the prison and attains union with God. With this realisation the Sufi declares war against the body and tries to rescue his spirit. This generates restlessness, heat and fury in the animal soul which links the spirit with the body. So long as the struggle goes on, the Sufi knows no peace, takes no rest, is passionate and mad. He does not cool down unless he effaces himself and becomes one with God.<sup>34</sup>

On the other hand, the love which the Shari'ah speaks of is a 'rational love' (*hubb-i-'aqîlî*). It is born of a sense of gratitude to God for His bounties, and of a sense of greatness, perfection, and majesty of God, on the one hand, and of man's absolute dependence on Him and his own nothingness, on the other. These are, according to the Qur'an, the twin sources of faith, and on this ground Shâh Ismâ'il calls the prophetic love the 'love of faith' (*hubb-i-imânî*).<sup>35</sup>

The passionate love and the love of faith do not differ in their origin only, they also differ in the factors which strengthen them (*mu'ayyidât*), the feelings and attitudes which accompany them (*âthâr*) and the effects and results which follow from them (*thamarât*). Shâh Ismâ'il has discussed all these things at great length; I can only note down the main points:

Passionate love is promoted by cutting down the needs of the body – food, drink and sleep – and by speaking little and by reducing contact with people. This helps to weaken the animal soul, and as the animal soul becomes weak the love of God increases. It is further strengthened by hearing sweet voices, listening to love songs, lyrical poems and passion stories.<sup>36</sup>

The 'love of faith' needs none of these things, nor does it declare war against the body; it only demands moderation and restraint. In order to promote this love one 'has to obey the Shari'ah, try hard to follow the Sunnah, hate to indulge in innovations, and honestly observe the rules of the Qur'an and the hadith regarding external behaviour and internal life'.<sup>37</sup> This is enough to break the defiance of the soul and make it submissive. The love of faith is strengthened 'not by

killing the will but by preferring God's will over one's own will'.<sup>38</sup> It is further strengthened by working for His religion, defending faith, reviving the Sunnah, promoting the rule of the Shari'ah, fighting against evil and injustice, removing poverty, sickness and misery, and by creating conditions of well-being and happiness in society.<sup>39</sup>

Shâh Ismâ'il observes that even the *dhikr* and *fikr* which are the main plank of the passionate love mean one thing in the Sufi context, and a different thing in the context of the 'love of faith'.<sup>40</sup>

Passionate love is by nature wild and unruly. 'Since it wants to rend the human veil asunder and unite with its Divine source it does not bother much about the rules of the Shari'ah or the norms of good behaviour.'<sup>41</sup> It does not mind indulging in improper behaviour such as listening to instrumental music, courting love, practising *shughi' barzakh*, sitting idle, saying neither *dhikr* nor doing anything else.<sup>42</sup> This does not mean, Shâh Ismâ'il adds, that those who follow the path of 'passionate love' do not observe the *Sharî'* or behave properly. They do, and do very nicely, but they do it more out of respect for the Shari'ah rather than out of love, and at times in spite of it.<sup>43</sup> The same wild tendency is visible in the love which the traveller of the Sufi path has for his preceptor; he tends to make it absolute and likes not to put any constraints on it.<sup>44</sup> A passionate lover seeks to live alone, occupies only with God; shuns people; has no interest in human affairs, society or government; knows no responsibilities towards family, relatives and neighbours; and hates marriage because that involves him in the cobweb of social relations.<sup>45</sup> He is not able to understand the interrelation between the external and the internal aspects of the Shari'ah. He does not appreciate why the Shari'ah emphasises the observance of its exoteric rules along with the cultivation of internal virtues. He therefore tends to neglect the external aspect of the Shari'ah and concentrate on the internal realities.<sup>46</sup>

The man who pursues 'the love of faith' is concerned equally with both aspects of the Shari'ah, external and internal. He sees the Shari'ah as a unity, and tries to obey it in its totality.<sup>47</sup> He does not look for 'talking to God, seeing

His vision, experiencing *fanâ* and *baqâ*, or knowing the realities of things'.<sup>48</sup> His objective is one: to fulfil the will of God. He preaches Islam and strives to establish the Shari'ah, undaunted by dangers and hardships of the way. He feels pleasure in devotion and obedience, and finds peace of heart in communion (*munâjâi*). He hates sin, abhors evil, and loves to do whatever pleases God. He is not self-centred; on the contrary, he is very much concerned with the well-being of the people, and works for their piety and happiness.<sup>49</sup> The end of passionate love is union with God. The traveller of this path loses his individuality and is assimilated in God, just as a piece of iron put in a fire becomes red like fire. At this stage the passionate lover would often say: 'I am God', as the piece of red iron, had it a tongue, would like to say: 'I am fire'. From a lover in this state miracles often proceed; his prayers are responded to, and his petitions for people are granted. He perceives that things depend upon God for their existence and sustenance, and realises how God comprehends everything. He sees that there is only One Being there, and believes in the unity of existence.<sup>50</sup>

Union, illumination or the vision of One Being are not the fruits of the love of faith. God bestows upon the lover of faith quite different honours. He raises him to the stage of *muhaddath*, *shahîd* and *hawârî*; that is, He reveals in his heart the truths of religion, makes him its witness, and raises him as its preacher and defender. He bestows on him real conviction (*imân-i-haqiqî*), and elevates him to the position of His own deputy (*khalifat Allâh*), as he did with David, helps him to establish his Shari'ah, defeat his enemies and overcome his opposition.<sup>51</sup>

The above discussion underlines most of the important features of the Sufi way that distinguish it from the prophetic way. It also brings out how the piety which Sufism usually promotes differs from the piety which the prophetic religion cultivates. This is one aspect of the relation between Sufism and the Shari'ah which Sirhindî, and following him Wali Allâh and Shah Ismâ'îl have made clear. We may now turn to the other aspects.

### Shari'ah and Ma'rîfah

Sirhindî uses the Shari'ah in two senses. First, the usual sense of the rules and regulations of the Qur'an and the Sunnah concerning worship and rites, morals and society, economy and government, along with the elaborations and applications of these rules by scholars which agree with the Qur'an and the Sunnah. But often he uses the term in a wider sense which along with rules and laws also includes faith and belief, values and ideals, as well as the Prophet's way to cultivate piety and achieve God's pleasure. In other words, the Shari'ah means everything which God has prescribed (*shara'a*) directly or through the Prophet, and is identical with the Prophetic religion.<sup>52</sup>

Shari'ah in this sense is not only a comprehensive system of faith and practice, it is also self-sufficient. 'It comprehends', Sirhindî writes, 'all the goods of this world and the next, leaving nothing out for which one should have to go beyond the Shari'ah'.<sup>53</sup>

Let me elaborate on this statement which Sirhindî makes in all seriousness. The first part of the Shari'ah is faith (*imân*), which means conviction in transcendental realities – God, angels, the Hereafter, revelation, prophecy, etc., as defined by the Shari'ah. Sirhindî clearly states that the only way to know these realities of faith is the revelation (*wâhi*) of the Prophet. Neither reason nor mystic *kashf* is capable of revealing them. Reason working by itself cannot establish these realities; its arguments are at best inconclusive and fail to produce conviction. Sirhindî writes: 'Everything that we know through the prophets regarding God's existence and attributes, prophets and revelation, the impeccability of angels, resurrection, Paradise and Hell, eternal happiness and damnation, and other similar truths which the Shari'ah has revealed to us, are impossible to know through reason. Before hearing from the prophets, reason is incapable of establishing them by itself.'<sup>54</sup> His view regarding the inability of reason in matters of faith is not different from what al-Ghazâlî has said in the *Munqidh* and the *Tâhâfut* whose remarks he often quotes with approval.<sup>55</sup>

On the position of mystic *kashf*, however, Sirhindî has a

different view, which is to be seriously considered particularly by those who make knowledge of reality the ultimate goal of Sufism. First of all, he denies that *kashf* is an independent source of knowledge parallel to revelation. It can only act as an interpreter of the Prophetic revelation (*wahy*) concerning matters of faith. ‘Inspiration (*iħħam*) only brings out’, he says, ‘the non-apparent truths of religion; it is not to add upon its truths. As *ijtihād* reveals rules that are implied (in the Shari‘ah), similarly, *iħħam* reveals the hidden truths (of faith) which ordinary people are not able to see’.<sup>56</sup> Second, even in this capacity of interpreter, *kashf* is not infallible; like the *ijtihād* of *amrijahid*, the *kashf* of a Sufi may be right or it may be wrong. Inspiration is uncertain (*zanni*) and the revelations of *kashf* do not generate truth.<sup>57</sup> Third, if the ideas of a mystic in the light of his *kashf* contradict the views of the theologians of the *Ahl* ‘*I-Sunnah* they should be treated as the product of intoxication (*sukr*) of the Sufi and rejected as untrue. ‘There are mystical ideas which conflict with the views of the *Ahl-i-Haqq* (i.e. theologians of *Ahl* ‘*I-Sunnah*) . . . in such cases the truth is with the ‘ulamā’ of the *Ahl-i-Haqq*.’<sup>58</sup> At another place he writes: ‘The criterion of the validity of mystical ideas (*‘ulūm ladunniyah*) is that they should agree with the clear ideas of the disciplines (*ulūm*) of the Shari‘ah; if there is a hair’s breadth of divergence, it is due to *sukr*. The truth is what the ‘ulamā’ of the *Ahl* ‘*I-Sunnah wa I-Jamā‘ah* have established. All else is blasphemy (*zandaqah*), heresy (*iħħad*), and the result of intoxication (*sukr*) and ecstasy (*ghajebat* ‘*I-hāl*).’<sup>59</sup> In other words, the *kashf* of a Sufi is subject to the authority not only of the text of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, but also of their interpretation by theological reason.

Al-Ghazālī’s views on this subject are quite different. In his opinion, the Prophetic revelation does not speak clearly about transcendental realities of faith, and uses the language of symbols and metaphors. One has to interpret this language and decipher what it really means.<sup>60</sup> Theological reason is not quite qualified to perform that job, and the only thing on which you can rely is the mystic *kashf*. Hence for al-Ghazālī *kashf* is the most reliable instrument of interpretation. It is not at all subject to theological reason. On the

contrary, theology has to submit to mystical revelations. In the *Iḥyā* and other writings of the mystical period, al-Ghazālī plays down theological reason and extols *kashf*; he seems at times to elevate *kashf* to the status of a parallel source of knowledge besides revelation (*wahy*). *Kashf* is true, he believes, provided it does not contradict a clear and unequivocal statement of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, or violate the fundamental rules of reason, or an established truth.<sup>61</sup>

Ibn ‘I-Arabi agrees essentially with al-Ghazālī; he would not, however, go to the extent of al-Ghazālī in disparaging reason. He would rather allow reason a greater role, even consider it another source for the knowledge of reality, of course, at a lower status to that of *kashf*.<sup>62</sup>

The views of the founders of the four great Sufi orders are not different from the views of Sirhindī. I have referred before<sup>63</sup> to the views of Khwājah Naqshband and his influence on Sirhindī. Shaykh Shihāb ‘I-Dīn ‘I-Suhrawardi (d. 632/1234) defines in the ‘Awārif ‘I-Mā’ārif the scope of the ‘privileged’ knowledge of the Sufis which he calls knowledge by inheritance (*‘ilm I-warāhah*) in these words:

It is the knowledge of the status and stations; knowledge of ideas that enter the heart; knowledge of faith and sincerity; knowledge of the soul (*al-nafs*), its nature and dispositions which is the best knowledge of the Sufis; knowledge of the different kinds of worldly life, desires, particularly the subtle ones, whether good or evil; knowledge of what is indispensable and how to make the soul content with minimum in speech and action, food and drink, clothing and sleep; knowledge of repentance, true and sincere, of sins that are subtle, and lapses that are small for the ordinary man but serious for the pious; knowledge how to force the soul to give up what is useless, and guard against things that are not needed; knowledge of contemplation (*murāqabah*) and of things which obstruct it; knowledge of self-examination and protection, trust (*tawakkul*), satisfaction (*ridā*) . . . , renunciation (*zuhd*) . . . , seeking God (*inābah*) . . . , praying (*du‘ā*) . . . , and love . . . ; knowledge of states such as awe (*hayrah*), fellowship (*uns*), contraction (*qabq*), expansion (*basī*) . . . ; knowledge of *fana*’ and *baqā*’ and their various degrees; knowledge of disappearance (*istiħār*), and appearance

(*tajallī*), union (*jam'*) and separation (*farq*) flashes (*lawāmi'*), glimmers (*lawā'i*) and glimpses (*bawādī*); knowledge of sobriety and intoxication, etc.<sup>64</sup>

It is clear from this exposition that al-Suhrawardi's '*ilm*'-'*l-warā'ihah* is the knowledge of the Sufi *tarīqah* and *sulūk*, virtues and vices, practices and exercises, experiences and attainments, states and stations. There is no mention here of metaphysical truths. Al-Suhrawardi is in fact very sceptical regarding the efficacy of *kashf* in revealing transcendental realities. His attitude is quite clear from his discussion on the nature of spirit (*al-rūh*), which is the only subject that has any philosophical interest in the whole book. He opens the discussion by saying that the proper course for Sufis is to abstain from enquiring into the spirit, and quotes Junayd's words: 'God has kept the knowledge of the spirit to Himself.' Then he goes on to cite the views which different Sufis have expressed, and concludes: 'I am not sure about any of these views; I would rather prefer to be silent and abstain.'<sup>65</sup> It is not without significance that al-Suhrawardi, writing half a century after al-Ghazzālī, should choose to call the esoteric knowledge of the Sufis '*ilm*'-'*l-warā'ihah* rather than '*ilm*'-'*l-mukashafah*' which through its use by the latter had acquired a metaphysical connotation.

The same, I believe, is the position of Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī (d. 561/1166). There is nothing in his *Ghunya'at 'l-Tālibin* and *Futūh 'l-Ghayyb* which might lead us to form a different idea.

### Shari'ah and *Haqīqah*

*Haqīqah* in Sufi literature at times means the perception of reality in mystical experience; and is contrasted with the rational comprehension of reality by the philosophers, on the one hand, and the faith of the common man, on the other. This sense is usually conveyed by the term *ma'rīyah*; the latter, however may also refer to concepts and doctrines about reality in the light of the Sufi experience. More often *haqīqah* refers to what, according to the Sufis, religious life really means. What, for instance, is the reality

(*haqīqah*) of faith, sincerity (*ikhlās*) and *tawhīd*; what is the essence of worship, prayer and *dhikr*; what do *zakāt*, charity or *jihād* in reality mean; what is true love, fear, abstinence, renunciation, thanksgiving, patience, trust and resignation (*rīḍah*); what in sum is the reality of piety (*taqwā*) and *ihśān*, or religious life at its perfection.

How does a Sufi view these realities (*haqā'iq*)? Does he believe that the Shari'ah defines them, explains clearly and definitely what they mean, and tells how to realise them truly and fully? Or does he have to resort to other means such as his mystical experience, *kashf* and vision to know these realities, and to his *tarīqah* and *sulūk* to acquire them? Or does he have partly to depend on the Shari'ah and partly on his own means? In short, what is the relation between the Shari'ah and the *haqīqah*?

On this question there are different views among the Sufis. One view, which Sirhindī believes to be the right one, is that the Shari'ah defines what religious life truly is, what are its constituents and what they really mean. Shari'ah is not just a code of rules and regulations that govern external action. It also explains what faith, *tawhīd*, love, trust, gratitude, patience, worship, *dhikr*, *jihād*, *taqwā* and *ihśān* are, and shows how to realise these realities. It is concerned with outer behaviour as well as with internal states of mind and will, with faith and virtue, motive and intention, feelings and emotions. It is both form (*sūrah*) and reality (*haqīqah*); it is a complete unity.<sup>66</sup> Further, it also shows how to attain the real and perfect life of piety and *ihśān*. The Sufi *tarīqah* is only a means to achieve the realities of religious life as defined by the Shari'ah. It does not claim to tell what, for instance, *tawhīd* is, or what virtues like love, trust, resignation, etc., mean, or what *ihśān* consists of. It is only to confirm what the Shari'ah says, and not to tell anything new or add any new dimension. There are no realities outside the Shari'ah and the Sufi *tarīqah* is only a further help to attain those realities.

The other view which many a Sufi holds, is that the Shari'ah is essentially a code of law that seeks to regulate external behaviour. It is concerned with the outer structure of religious life, but not with the inner reality. The realities

of faith and religious life lie outside the Shari'ah, and can be known as well as attained only through Sufi ways. In other words, the Shari'ah is a form without reality, a bone without the marrow, chaff without the grain. Sirhindi refers to this group of Sufis in these words:

Others are concerned with reality (*haqiqah*). But their reality is not the reality of the Shari'ah; for them the Shari'ah is merely a form, nothing but a shell. The kernel in their view lies beyond this shell.<sup>67</sup>

Most of these Sufis, however, observe the laws of the Shari'ah; they avoid what is forbidden, perform what has been enjoined, and follow what is recommended. They never think that they can at any time dispense with the Shari'ah. Sirhindi does not, obviously, approve of their views; but he does not find fault with their practice either. On the contrary, he says: 'They are the friends (*awliyā*) of God', and excuses their views on the ground that 'they have given up everything for the love of God'.<sup>68</sup>

A small group of Sufis however believe that they are obliged to follow the Shari'ah till they achieve *ma'rifah*. When they attain *ma'rifah*, the obligations of the *Shar'* no longer apply. If they still observe the Shari'ah, they do so not because they need it, but because they want those who have not yet realised the truth to continue to follow the Shari'ah. The Shari'ah, in their view, is for the common man who does not or cannot know the truth; but those who have known the truth do not need it any longer. Sirhindi condemns this view as 'sheer heresy and infidelity'. The truth is just the opposite. 'Those who are more advanced (in Sufism) need worship ten times more than the novice; for their progress depends upon devotion and their attainments are conditioned on their continued compliance to the Shari'ah.'<sup>69</sup> Sirhindi is here saying what all great Sufis have always said. I will quote just one, Junayd. He was told that some gnostics of God had reached a stage where they had dispensed with right acts and devotions. Junayd reacted sharply: 'These people talk of dropping good works; it is indeed a grave sin; they are worse than thieves and adulterers. The true gnostics of God accept the commands of God and turn to Him in

submission. If I were to live for a thousand years I would not stop doing even the smallest things, unless I was prevented from doing them.'<sup>70</sup>

Those who believe that the Shari'ah is only a form (*sūrah*), and think that the reality (*haqiqah*) lies outside the Shari'ah, do so for various reasons. Some follow the course of Sufi *tariqah*, reach the stage of union and identity, but do not proceed beyond. Others start with a belief in unity and identity on philosophical grounds and subsequently realise it in their experience. Whatever way they proceed, when they reach the stage of union and identity their progress is arrested. They develop the belief that Unity of Being is the ultimate truth, and begin to see all the realities of religion in that light. They identify *tawhid*, for instance, with *wahdat l-wujūd*, and conclude that the Shari'ah does not teach the real *tawhid*. Some like Tilimsānī<sup>71</sup> (d. 690/1291) feel no scruples to pronounce: 'The Shari'ah is all *shirk* and the real *tawhid* is in our doctrine.'<sup>72</sup> This is an example of how and to what extent mystical experience and ideas can change the view of what the reality of faith or religious life is.

The other factor which leads some Sufis to unconsciously place the *haqiqah* outside the Shari'ah is their personal attitude. For some people a life of renunciation, devotion, *dhikr* and contemplation is a life much more authentic and real than a life in which devotion and *dhikr* are combined at a reduced level with service to man, participation in community, struggle for a just social order, *da'wah* and *jihād*. Such Sufis see very little reality (*haqiqah*) in the Shari'ah; and see more reality in absorption and *fana'*, rapture and ecstasy.

#### Rules of the Shari'ah and *Kashf*

There is general agreement among Sufis that the only way to know what things are legal or illegal, and what acts are right or wrong is the Qur'an, the Sunnah of the Prophet, the *ijtihād* of qualified jurists (*muftahidin*), and their consensus (*ijmā'*). These are also the means for knowing the degrees of obligation, whether a thing is obligatory (*fard/wājib*) or

forbidden (*harām*), commendable (*mandūb*), undesirable (*makruh*), or permissible (*mubāh*). The inspiration (*iḥrām*) or the *kashf* of the Sufi has no role in this regard, neither in determining the legality or otherwise of things, nor in fixing the degree of their obligation.

Shaykh Sirhindi states the common view in the clearest terms:

It is commonly agreed that in determining the rules (*ahkām*) of the Shari'ah, what counts is the Qur'ān, the Sunnah of the Prophet, the *qiyās* of a qualified jurist (*mujtahid*) and the consensus of the Ummah. No other principle apart from these four is to be taken into consideration to determine the legality of rules. Inspiration (*iḥrām*) does not determine whether something is right or wrong, and the *kashf* of a Sufi does not establish the degree of a rule, whether it is obligatory or desirable. The saints (*awliyā'*) have to follow, like an ordinary Muslim, the opinions of the *mujtahids*. Their revelations (*kushūf*) and inspirations (*iḥrāmāt*) do not elevate their status and relieve them from following the judgements of the jurists (*fugahā'*). Dhū 'l-Nūn, al-Bisṭāmī, Junayd and al-Shiblī are just like ordinary men, Zayd, 'Umar, Bakr and Khālid. They have to follow the judgements of the jurists (*mujtahidīn*) in matters of *iḥrām*.<sup>73</sup>

Shaykh Ibn 'l-'Arabī reiterates the same view:

The angel does not descend to the heart of anyone other than the prophet, and reveals no command of God at all. The Shari'ah has been fixed, and what is incumbent (*fard*) or obligatory (*wājib*), desirable (*mandūb*), permissible (*mubāh*) or undesirable (*makruh*) has been defined. No new order will be issued from God, as prophecy (*nubuwwah*) and messengership (*risālah*) have come to an end. . . . We absolutely rule out the possibility that one can be given a new Shari'ah for him to follow or preach to others . . . (If a wali gets something in a vision), he should examine it in the light of the Qur'ān and Sunnah. If it agrees with them he should consider it as a communication of truth and an honour, but nothing more. It does not add to (the Shari'ah) or produce a new command. It may, however, explain a command or tell what it means. It may elevate his belief into knowledge. In case the vision does not agree with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah he should still consider it real but he must believe

that it is a test. There is no other possibility. He should not think that it is an angelic appearance (*raqiqah nafākiyah*) or a Divine illumination (*mujlā ilāhi*); it is only a satanic appearance (*raqiqah shayāniyah*).<sup>74</sup>

The Shaykh, however, allows this role to the Sufi *kashf*:

(*Kashf*) may tell that a rule which has been established as a (Divine) command is true, or that it is really a command of God to a particular prophet for the people to whom he has been sent. It may also tell that a rule whose validity has been established by the scholars of tradition ('ulamā' *i-rusūm*) is in fact invalid. The saint may know the validity of a valid rule, and the invalidity of an invalid rule, even though it has been transmitted through weak chains (*isnād*); he may similarly know the validity of a rule which has been considered invalid, or the invalidity of a rule which has been considered valid, by the scholars of tradition.<sup>75</sup>

I do not believe that Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi or any other established Sufi would allow to the Sufi *kashf* this authority to pronounce upon the grounds of a rule of the Shari'ah, and say that it is sound or unsound, particularly in opposition to the judgement of the scholars of tradition regarding those grounds.

It would be worthwhile to distinguish between a rule of the Shari'ah and its application in a particular situation. So far as the rule is concerned, Sufis, as we have noted, do not allow any role to *kashf*. In the application of the rule, however, *kashf* may have a place. It is reported of Ḥarīth 'l-Muḥāṣibī<sup>76</sup> (165/781–243/857), for instance, that whenever he was invited to a meal which was not quite pure (*iḥār*), his forefinger quivered and he would abstain from eating.<sup>77</sup> This is a case of *kashf* helping to determine whether something falls under the category of things to be avoided on the grounds recognised in the Shari'ah. *Kashf* helps to determine a matter of fact, rather than a matter of rule.

*Kashf* may also be helpful in making a decision in cases which are vague and unclear; that is, where arguments from the Shari'ah conflict and one does not see what course one should take. In such cases the Prophet, peace be upon him,

has advised to consult one's heart;<sup>78</sup> *kashf* may also be helpful. But let us note that the *kashif* of one wali is an argument for him, but not for others. This is in contrast to the *ijtihād* of a jurist, which is an argument for him as well as for others.<sup>79</sup>

### Values of the Shari'ah and Sufism

Besides beliefs, virtues and rules, there is a fourth aspect of the Shari'ah: its vision of the good life. What is the good life which the Shari'ah envisages? What are its constituents? How do the goods of the body stand with the goods of the spirit? How far does the good of society constitute the good of the individual, and how does the good of this life compare with the good of the next life? Similarly, what are the principles that determine the degree of obligation, define what is obligatory, what is highly commended, and what is less commended, and what is left to our discretion? In short, what is the overall ideal of the Shari'ah, what are its values and priorities?

To raise some specific questions: What is the ultimate goal of man: knowledge of God (*ma'rīfah*), union with Him (*jam'*) or fulfilment of His will ('*ubūdiyah*)? Have the other components of the good life a value in themselves? How are they related to the ultimate good? Another question about the relation between this life and the next: In order to make the life-hereafter good, should one concentrate on some aspects of life neglecting the others, or should one work for the fulfilment of the whole life in the way the Shari'ah wants? How does the Shari'ah value exclusive devotion to God, *dhikr* and meditation in comparison to a life in which these things are reduced and combined with an active involvement in the overall happiness of human beings?

The Qur'an refers along with beliefs, virtues and rules, to these matters also; tells what is the ideal life; what are its constituents; how they compare with each other; and who are the embodiments of that good life. The Sunnah of the Prophet further elaborates Islamic values and priorities. But Islamic thought has done little to carry the task further. *Fiqh*

has been more concerned with particular aspects of life, with various forms of worship, with social, political, economic activities separately, and has defined what is right or wrong, obligatory or commendable in each and every field. There are various schools of *fiqh*; and in each there are hundreds of books that discuss rules down to the minutest details; there are also many books that deal with the principles of these schools. But there are not half a dozen works<sup>80</sup> which address some of the questions we have raised.

Philosophical works on ethics (*akhlāq*) in Arabic and Persian which should have discussed these questions, unfortunately rehearse Greek ethics, and hardly attempt to explicate the Shari'ah. They do introduce changes and modifications into the inherited system, but that does not affect its basic character. They hardly attempt to give Islamic answers to fundamental questions of ethics in the light of the Qur'an and Sunnah and explain the Islamic Shari'ah.<sup>81</sup> Sufis had, therefore, nothing to check their understanding and interpretation of Islamic values and priorities in the light of their *kashf* and experience, demands of the *tariqah* or philosophical beliefs. Shaykh Ibn 'l-'Arabī, for instance, discovered in his experience that unity is the fundamental truth, and the difference between God and man is relative and secondary. He, therefore, concluded that what promotes unity is superior to what emphasises difference, and on that principle extolled fasting over *ṣalāt*. Sirhindī observes:

Some *wujūdīs* (i.e. the believers in *wahdat 'l-wujūd*) hold that prayer (*ṣalāt*) does not avail (*dūr az kār asf*), because it is based, in their view, on the assumption of another (*ghayr*) and his otherness. They consequently extol fasting over *ṣalāt*. The author of the *Futūhāt Makkīyah* says that in fasting, which is abstaining from eating and drinking, one participates in the holiness (*ṣamādiyat*) of God, whereas in the *ṣalāt* one comes down to the other and otherness, and distinguishes between the worshipper and the worshipped. This statement is based, as you know, on the doctrine of *tawhīd wujūdī* which is the lot of the intoxicated people.<sup>82</sup>

The *tariqah* of the Sufi requires him to concentrate on *dhikr* and meditation to the neglect of other means of

self-purification recommended by the Shari'ah, and raises their value beyond all proportions. Similarly, the effort to achieve concentration, self-effacement, ecstasy and union, which require the Sufi to drastically reduce the needs of the body and contacts with people, put a premium on renunciation (*zuhd*) which the Shari'ah would not approve,<sup>83</sup> and applaud withdrawal which the Shari'ah would not allow except in unusual situations, and that, too, as a second alternative.<sup>84</sup>

The example of a philosophical belief affecting a Sufi judgement regarding what is the highest good of man is provided by al-Ghazālī. In his *Mizān l-'Amal* where he discusses the question what is the highest good or happiness (*sa'ādah*) of man, he reproduces an argument stated by Plato in the *Republic*<sup>85</sup> and Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*,<sup>86</sup> and summarised by Miskawayh (d. 421/1030) in his *Kiāb l-Sa'ādah*<sup>87</sup> and *Tahdhīb l-Akhlaq*.<sup>88</sup> The argument says that the happiness of man lies in the perfection of reason which is distinctive of man.<sup>89</sup> Originally this included knowledge of realities as well as the organisation of life in the light of reason. But for some reasons knowledge of reality came to be considered as the highest happiness of man, and the life of reason and virtue was regarded as a lower happiness. The value of virtue and rational life was further diminished in some writings<sup>90</sup> of al-Fārābī (d. 339/950). Al-Ghazālī went further: he identified the happiness (*sa'ādah*) of man with the comprehension of the realities of things,<sup>91</sup> and degraded action to the status of a means<sup>92</sup> to the acquisition of knowledge. Nothing was good in itself except knowledge; that alone constituted the real happiness of man. Everything else: worship, morality and social life (not to speak of the goods of the body) was to have only an instrumental value. This ideal of contemplative life which he works out in the *Mizān*, al-Ghazālī ascribes not only to philosophers but also to Sufis<sup>93</sup> who, for him, represent Islamic life at its best. He never thinks of examining the argument to see whether it is valid, or whether it can be corroborated from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. He mentions in passing the verse which defines the purpose of man's creation as the '*ibādah*'<sup>94</sup> of God, and the verse which announces that man is the

viceroy (*khalīfah*)<sup>95</sup> of God on the earth. But neither verse engages his attention or appears to contain an answer. Al-Ghazālī holds essentially the same view of human happiness in the *Iḥyā*; and he bolsters it with further arguments,<sup>96</sup> none of which are derived from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet nor supported by *kashf*.

Sirhindī does not enter into a discussion of the values and priorities of the Shari'ah and their relation with Sufism. In the light of the history of Islamic thought which I have briefly reviewed, this is quite understandable. Nevertheless, it would not be difficult to form an idea of his position. He does not assign any independent role to *kashf* in theological matters, nor accord to it any place in juristic issues pertaining to what is right or wrong, obligatory or desirable. Nor does he think that reason is a reliable guide in these matters. On the other hand, he has made statements that call for strict adherence to the Shari'ah, and condemn every divergence as innovation (*bid'at*), as we have seen before.<sup>97</sup> Further, he states clearly that the purpose of man and the ultimate goal of his life is obedience to God's will as enshrined in the Shari'ah and defined by it. In the light of all this we would expect him to believe that the Shari'ah has its own system of values and priorities, which can only be revealed by contemplating over its structure, not by *kashf* or philosophical speculation.

### Prophet and Prophecy

The prophet is a wali with a mission to transform society. This is the essence of the definition of a prophet that Dr. Muhammad Iqbāl offers in his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*.<sup>98</sup> This view of prophecy originated with the earliest Sufis. It was probably first proffered by al-Hakim Tirmidhī<sup>99</sup> (d. 216/831) and was reiterated by al-Ghazālī,<sup>100</sup> Ibn 'Arabī<sup>101</sup> and many others. It has now become a part of Islamic thought.

Sirhindī, too, starts with the same idea, and there is no indication that he ever thought of revising it, even though he disagreed with other Sufis regarding some parts of the idea. But if we pursue carefully his definition of *walāyat*,

and his distinctions between the way of the wali and the way of the prophet, we arrive at conclusions that could well have startled Sirhindī himself, and call for a revision of the view. Before entering into the discussion, however, I would try to clarify the different senses in which Sirhindī uses the term *walāyat*. He uses it, first of all, in the sense of nearness and intimacy with God, irrespective of the nature of the nearness or the procedure employed for the purpose. Thus he uses terms like *walāyat* of the Great Angels (*Mala' A'la*), the saints *walāyat* of the prophets, and the *walāyat* of the saints (*awliyā'*). He uses *walāyat*, secondly, to refer to the first phase of the Sufi's *sayr*, which consists of moving mentally towards God (*sayr ilā Allāh*) and moving in God (*sayr fi Allāh*), leading up to union with God. It is called the ascent (*'urij*) of the Sufi as compared to the second phase of descent (*nuzūl*) in which the Sufi mentally moves away from God (*sayr 'an Allāh*) and then with God in the world (*sayr dar ashyā'*). He refers, thirdly, to one of the two moments of the life of a prophet, namely, his contact with God as distinct from his contact with people and the world, which he calls *risālat* or *nubūwat*. He means, fourthly, the Sufi way (*tariq-i-walāyat*) of *sulūk* and self-perfection (*tazkiyah*) as compared to the prophetic way (*tariq-i-nubūwar*); and, lastly, Sufism itself.

When Sirhindī predicates *walāyat* to a prophet, he means either the prophet's nearness (*qurb*) to God, or his contact with God as distinct from his contact with people. He does not use the term in the sense of a spiritual phase, namely, the phase of ascent, such as the one we have in the life of a Sufi. The important thing is that the prophet's contact with God and his contact with people are not two different phases of his life, one coming after the other, as in the case of the Sufi. They are rather two moments of his life. For, he does not undergo the experience of *fānā'* and *baqā'* as the Sufi does. He does not experience self-annihilation or self-dissolution, union or merger into God. He does not have the unitive experience, never feels ecstasy and intoxication, does not lose control over his reason, or indulge in *shāth*. And since he does not unite with God, he does not separate from Him either. He has no unification and no separation, no

ascent and no descent. He is never so absorbed in God as to lose sight of himself and the world; and never so occupied with the world as to forget God. He is always occupied with God, even when he appears to be immersed in the world. 'In prophecy', Sirhindī says, 'the prophet does not face the creation only, he faces God along with facing the world.'<sup>102</sup>

If this is the case with the prophet, and we have seen Sirhindī, Wali Allāh and Shāh Ismā'īl, all assuring us that it is so, then what is the justification for treating the prophet as a wali? Certainly he is a wali, and the greatest of all the walis in the sense in which the Qur'ān uses the term. But in the sense of a Sufi who traverses the whole road of *sulūk* and *jadhbah*, experiences *fānā'* and *baqā'*, feels ecstasy and intoxication, unites and separates, ascends and descends, there is no justification for calling him a wali. The prophet is not a wali in the mystical sense, nor is prophecy a form of *walāyat* in that sense. The experience of prophecy is an altogether different experience, and the prophet is in a category by himself. This is the conclusion to which the observations of Sirhindī and Wali Allāh on *walāyat* and *nubūwat* lead. Unfortunately they did not pursue their line of thought sufficiently enough to come to this startling discovery.

The prophet, however, shares a lot of experiences with the wali; he sees dreams (*ru'yā*) and visions (*mushāhadat*/*wāqi'iāt*), receives ideas directly in the heart (*ilhām/ilqā'*), hears voices, and talks to appearances. These extraordinary forms of revelation which together are called *kashf* are common between the wali and the prophet. Two things, however, distinguish the revelation of the prophet from the revelation of the wali. One, the prophet has a particular form of revelation, namely, revelation through the angel called *wāhi* in a special sense of the term; the wali does not have it. *Wāhi* in this sense is specific to the prophet, and is the real basis of prophecy. Second, all the revelations of the prophet, whether *wāhi* in the special sense, or in the form of a dream, vision, audition and inspiration are true and certain; but the revelations of the wali are fallible and uncertain (*zanni*).<sup>103</sup> A third difference which is actually a corollary of the second, is that the revelation of the prophet

is binding on people, whereas the *kashf* of a wall is not. *Kashf* is not an independent and sufficient argument; it needs to be confirmed by the prophetic revelation. The destiny of man, his eternal happiness or damnation, depends on his acceptance of the prophetic revelation; this is not true of *kashf*.<sup>104</sup>

The life of the prophet has two moments: One, his contact with God, his reception of *wahy*, his perception of Divine rule (*malakut Allah*), angels, Paradise and Hell; his *dhikr* and contemplation, prayer and supplication, fasting and pilgrimage; his turning to God for mercy and assistance; his love and fear, his faith and trust; his experience of God's blessings, help and honour; his thanksgiving and submission. The other is his contact with people, his recitation of *wahy*, his preaching and mission, his instruction to his followers in self-purification and piety, his struggle against his opponents, and his effort to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. These two aspects of the Prophet's life formed one whole, one intertwined with the other. Nobody in the days of the Companions, even their successors, thought to distinguish between them, and ask the question which aspect was higher and which was lower. That question was asked when Sufism came into being: when the life of poverty and renunciation, devotion and fasting, *dhikr* and meditation, love and absorption, *fana'* and *baqâ'*, *kashf* and illumination came to be applauded as the highest and most sublime life. The first aspect of the Prophet's life was called his *walâyat*, and was extolled over the second aspect which was called *nubûwat* and *risâlat*. People did not stop there: some of them even went to the extent of saying that the wali is superior to the prophet.

We have seen earlier how Sirhindi opposes the whole trend, and asserts that the *nabi* is definitely superior to the wali, even his *nubûwat* is superior to his *walâyat*. The Ummah and the Sufis in general have always held that the prophet is incomparably superior to the wali, and have strongly condemned the opposite view. But when comparing the *walâyat* of a *nabi* with his *nubûwat*, many a Sufi has extolled the former over the latter. The reason for doing this does not lie in the Qur'ân and the Sunnah, which alone

should be considered in such matters, but in their own personal experiences, attitudes, and philosophical beliefs. I would avoid going into details here and limit myself to stating Sirhindi's views. He definitely believes that the *nubûwat* of the prophet is superior to his *walâyat*. His arguments<sup>105</sup> are as follows:

It is not true, first of all, that in *nubûwat* the prophet's attention is turned away from God and centred on the people. The prophet does not experience an opposition between 'attention to God' and 'attention to people'. That opposition, rather conflict, is part of a wali's life; he experiences it particularly in the first stage of his *sulûk*. The prophet does not follow the Sufi *tarîqah*; consequently he does not experience the conflict. His attention to the people does not imply distraction from God; nor does his occupation with God mean disconcern with people. Secondly, in attending to the people, the prophet in fact attends to God, because he does not attend to them of his own will. He attends because God commands him to attend. Therefore, when he attends to them he attends to God. Finally, to attend to people on the command of God in order that they believe in Him, obey Him and come close to Him, is a hundred times better than to occupy oneself with God and concentrate on Him. God has in fact reserved the next life for that occupation. This life should better be devoted to carrying out His will and bringing His children near to Him.

Sirhindi has a broad view of a prophet's mission. His task begins with the preaching of the Shari'ah (*tarwîj-i-Shari'ah*), which, as I have noted above, stands for both his religion and laws. Those who believe in him and accept his religion, the prophet shows them how to act upon his teachings; how to worship God and remember Him; how to avoid sin and purify oneself; how to cultivate virtue and piety; and how to feel for humanity and work for their happiness. He tells them that the purpose of man's life is to serve God, and shows them how to attain God's pleasure. He preaches religion as well as demonstrates how to practise and live it. This is what Sirhindi calls the way of the prophet (*tarîq nubûwat*).

With those who follow him, the prophet struggles to build

a new society and create a new world. He tries to demolish that part of the old society which conflicts with his religion, and fights the powers that oppose him till they are subdued, or wiped out, and the rule of God is established on the earth. Sirhindī does not discuss this aspect at length, but he leaves none in doubt that for him it is an integral part of the prophet's mission. He refers to it in letters which he wrote to men in power, where he underscores the role of the ruler in Islam, his responsibility to implement the laws of the Shari'ah, to establish its institutions and to defend them against attacks from within and from without. In a letter, for instance, addressed to the governor of a province he writes: 'If along with your administrative work, you could implement the Shari'ah, you would be doing the work of the prophets.'<sup>106</sup>

### Companions of the Prophet

The prophets are the best of the people, Muhammad is the best of the prophets, and his Companions are the best of mankind next only to the prophets. Of his Companions those who embraced Islam before the conquest of Makkah and adhered to it braving all opposition and bearing every hardship, are better than those who joined the fold of Islam later. Though they were not of equal standing, some were of high and some of low merit, the lowest of the Companions is superior to the greatest wali of later times. 'Even Wahshi, the killer of Ḥamzah, who joined the fold of the Companions later, is better than Uways 1-Qarānī, the great *tābi'i* (belonging to the generation after the Companions) famous for his devotions.'<sup>107</sup>

The reason for their greatness is not their devotion or other meritorious acts; many walīs of succeeding ages have a greater record of devotion, prayers, fastings and *dhikr*. Their greatness is due primarily to two things: One is their faith, which because of their direct contact with the Prophet and his revelation was more than faith, a living experience.<sup>108</sup> The second reason is that they were the first to respond to the call of Islam, spent money and energy for its propagation,

bore all kinds of hardships in its way, fought its enemies, and sacrificed everything for its cause, till the word of God dominated over every other word, and His rule was established on the earth.<sup>109</sup>

Sirhindī makes it very clear that the greatness of the Companions does not lie in any 'new' knowledge over and above the simple faith in the Prophet's revelation. They did not have any extraordinary experience; did not know *fanā'* and *baqā'*, union or separation; did not take up severe penances or strenuous exercises; hardly received any theophanies or illuminations; and never experienced raptures or ecstasies. Nothing that distinguishes the wali was, therefore, the reason for their greatness. They purified themselves of vice, adorned themselves with virtue, cultivated righteousness and piety, and attained to the highest level of *ihsan*<sup>110</sup> by following the way of the Prophet and by working for his mission.

Wali Allāh corroborates this view when he says that in the eyes of the Prophet the criterion of greatness lies in things related to the mission of a prophet such as the propagation of faith, and persuasion of the people to follow religion, rather than *jadhūb* and *fanā'*.<sup>111</sup>

### Wali and *Walāyat*

The prophet in his faith and knowledge, virtue and piety, experience and attainments, marks the ultimate perfection of man, and sets the highest example to be followed. He is the criterion on which the wali and his *walāyat* is to be judged. There are walīs who are occupied exclusively with God and are lost in Him; they attend only to the most essential duties of religion such as *salāt*, and care little for themselves or for others. They are inferior to those who attend to the duties towards God as well as the duties towards men. The latter are superior,<sup>112</sup> because they live as the prophets live, and work as they work.

The Sufis who are absorbed in God (*majdhub*), have travelled only half the way. They have completed their journey to God (*savr ilā Allāh*) and journey in God (*sayr fi*

*Allāh*), have attained union (*jam'*), and continue to live in a state of intoxication (*sukr*) which union produces. The other group has advanced beyond that stage, has moved away from God with God (*say 'an Allāh bi Allāh*), attained separation after union (*farg ba'd 'l-jam'*), come out from the state of intoxication, and occupied themselves with people. They are the walis who have been returned (*mariū'*) to the world to engage themselves in the tasks which the prophets have been commanded to do. The first step on this way is to call (*da'wah*) people to God; the next is to purify them and make them true servants of God, and the last step is to establish the rule of His Shari'ah. The wali who follows the prophet more and serves his mission better, is a great wali and a closer friend of God.

Miracles, which common people consider to be a sign of *walāyat* and a measure of the greatness of a wali, are in fact neither. 'Miracles are neither a part of *walāyat* nor its condition; they are only a condition of prophecy (*nubūwat*).', 'And', Sirhindī continues, 'the number of miracles is no indication of a wali's status; that depends entirely on the degree of his nearness to God. It is quite possible that a wali who is less close to God works more miracles than the one who is more close.'<sup>113</sup> The greatest of walis are not equal to the smallest of the Companions; this is the consensus of the Ummah. But many walis are known to have worked a hundred times more miracles than the Companions. Moreover, the best among the walis, like Junayd, have been reported to have performed not even half a dozen miracles.<sup>114</sup> Further, miracles, such as revealing hidden things, or telling fortunes or future events, etc., do not even require that the doer should be a wali, not even a believer. The yogis, magicians and sorcerers work many more miracles.<sup>115</sup> The greatness of a Sufi is sometimes measured by the truths he receives in *kashf* and the doctrines he works out. Sirhindī divides them into three categories. There are ideas which confirm and elaborate the truths which are stated in the Qur'an and the Sunnah, or inferred from them by theologians. Sirhindī insists that *kashf*, in order to be acceptable should conform to theological doctrines. In laying down this criterion, he does not normally make any qualifi-

cation. But if we look at his own practice, we can safely say that what he really means is that *kashf* must not contradict fundamental doctrines of theology agreed upon by the theologians of the *Ahl l-Sunnah*, even though it may disagree in matters of detail. A case in point is the question of attributing *wujūd* (being/existence) to objects. Theologians in general do not subscribe to the Sufi idea that God alone exists, and predicate existence to the world, though they differentiate between the existence of God and the existence of objects, and build up their doctrine of Divine transcendence on that ground. Sirhindī does not think that theologians are right on the first count; consequently he ignores their view, and adopts the Sufi view. For, it is not the real issue. The truth that has to be affirmed is the theological idea of God's transcendence which the 'ulamā' have derived from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and on which they all agree. Sirhindī tries to combine the truth of Divine transcendence with the doctrine that God alone exists in the true sense. This is what distinguishes his philosophy from the philosophy of Ibn 'l-Arabi, as we will see.

The second category of revealed ideas (*ma'kūfāt*) are those which neither conform to the truths of the Qur'an and Sunnah nor contradict them. To this category belong the ideas about the heavens and the earth, the constitution of the world and its working, angels and jinni, spirits and other similar objects on which the Qur'an and Sunnah are either silent or say little. These ideas, Sirhindī says, may be true, and may be false, and points out various reasons why *kashf* errs. Sometimes, Satan may put a wrong idea in the mind of the Sufi; no wali is immune from Satanic insinuations (*ilqā'i-shay'iāni*);<sup>116</sup> the prophets, too, are vulnerable but they are promptly warned and their misplaced wishes are immediately corrected.<sup>117</sup> There is no guarantee for correction in the case of a wali. Error may enter into *kashf* for another reason. The wali may combine a true *kashf* with a false idea that he had got from other sources; as a result, his whole doctrine may become false. The third cause for error is the imagination (*khayāl*) of the Sufi. He may get ideas in *kashf* which are nothing more than the creations of imagination or fancy. A fourth cause for error is inaccuracy

in the apprehension of *kashf*. A Sufi may, for instance, see an event happening in the future, but fail to perceive some conditions on whose realisation the event is contingent. This may lead to a false prediction. A fifth cause for error is incorrect interpretation of things rightly perceived. These reasons render *kashf* uncertain and unreliable. Therefore, the ideas which are advanced on the basis of *kashf*, cannot be taken to be true, even though they do not conflict with the Qur'an and the Sunnah.

The third category consists of those ideas of *kashf* which conflict with the Shari'ah. Sirhindi puts the doctrines of One Actor (*tawhid fil'i*), One Subject (*tawhid sifā'i*) and One Being (*tawhid wujūdī*) in this category.<sup>118</sup> As the first two are implied in the third, we will discuss them together in the next section. To this category belong also the words which speak of union and identity with God, such as 'I am God', 'Glory to me', 'There is none in the cloak except God'. If they are taken as statements of reality, they conflict with the Shari'ah and are wrong. But if they are understood as expressions of feeling, which in truth they are, there is no harm. They are part of the Sufi *tariqah*, and happen to every traveler of that path. They show how far the Sufi has travelled, and hold promise<sup>119</sup> for the future. What is wrong is that they should be taken to mark the end of the road, or the Sufi should develop on their basis the belief that he is one with God. The Sufis whom God has taken beyond that stage, have realised that their earlier belief was erroneous, and have turned to God for His forgiveness. Many Sufis are definitely known to have crossed the stage of union, and realised the truth of servanthood ('ubidiyah); and many more are thought to have attained that, but we do not know them.

To the same category belong the ideas which go against the rules of the Shari'ah. Many evil innovations in Sufi practice are due to such revelations. Their error is due to the imagination of the Sufi or his wish, or the insinuation of Satan, or any other cause listed above. Ideas of goodness and perfection that are discordant with the Shari'ah also fall in this category. For instance, the idea that *walāyat* is superior to *nubūwat*, that the *walāyat* of a *nabi* is better than

his *nubūwat*, that the goal of man is to be one with God, that absorption is better than return, that intoxication is superior to sobriety, etc.

The ideas which elucidate the truths of the Shari'ah, strengthen commitment to its principles, and do not conflict with any of its concepts, rules and values, are a blessing of God on the Sufi, a favour and an honour, and a sign of his nearness to God. But the ideas which are over and above (*zā'id 'alā*) the Shari'ah, count neither for the greatness of the Sufi, nor for his position in the Hereafter. If they are true, their value will be judged, as any other good of the world, on the criterion of its utility. In case they are not true, the Sufi would be accountable for the harm that they might cause. But the ideas which conflict with the Shari'ah will put the Sufi in a difficult situation. Those which he has vented in an ecstatic experience or under the influence of an overpowering love may be hopefully overlooked by God; similarly the ideas which are related to matters of religion and which he has expounded in good faith, but are not correct, may also be excused. He may even be rewarded to an extent,<sup>120</sup> as a jurist will be rewarded who tries his best, but does not arrive at the right answer. But words which are flagrant violations of the Shari'ah, and are the result of deliberation are not excusable. Even if the Sufi means something different from what his words apparently convey, he is guilty of dishonouring the Shari'ah.<sup>121</sup>

How should one react to the ideas of a Sufi which appear to conflict with the Shari'ah, and what attitude should one have towards a Sufi who expounds those ideas? Sirhindi's answer to the first question would be like this: It is not right to believe in the idea or follow the practice of a Sufi who appears for other reasons to be a wali, if there seems to be some conflict with the Shari'ah. If you are an ordinary man, ignorant of the Sufi way, you should avoid condemning the wali and his ideas. But if you are aware of the Sufi ways and experiences, you should interpret them in their light. If they have emerged from the experience of *fana'* and have been said in a state of intoxication, they should be treated as *shāth* and the Sufi should be excused. One should remember that the ideas which the Sufis expound are not completely free

from intoxication (*sukr*) except when they reach the highest stage. 'Every stage below the stage of *siddiqiyat* is tainted with *sukr* in one degree or the other.'<sup>122</sup> And a person under *sukr* is not to be condemned. To sum up: The ideas of a wali which conflict with the Shari'ah should be recognised as such and should be rejected as wrong; the Sufi, however, should not be condemned but rather excused as he might have said them under intoxication.

This is exactly the attitude which Sirhindi adopts towards Shaykh Ibn 1-'Arabi. He believes that the doctrine of *wahdat i-wujūd* which the Shaykh expounds is essentially wrong, that many of its concepts and corollaries contradict the Shari'ah, and that its errors should be exposed and condemned. Consequently, he criticises the doctrine, exposes its errors and warns people against its dangers. On the other hand, he believes that the Shaykh expounded 'the doctrine in the light of his experience of oneness and identity. Though he did not stay at the stage of 'pure union' and moved ahead, he did not move sufficiently enough and affirm the complete transcendence of God and His absolute difference. This was his shortcoming. The Shaykh therefore deserves to be excused rather than condemned. So far as his *walāyat* is concerned, that depends entirely on his obedience to the Shari'ah, and his observance of the Sunnah of the Prophet. On that ground Sirhindi regards Ibn 1-'Arabi as a wali with whom God is well pleased. He believes that his mystical shortcoming and erroneous doctrines do not affect his *walāyat*. He thinks that this is the right attitude<sup>123</sup> towards the Shaykh. One should not approve of his erroneous ideas, or keep silent about them, because he is one of the *awliyā' of God*. But one should not condemn him as a heretic and an infidel either, disregarding completely his life and position, on the ground that he has expounded erroneous doctrines.

pursuits, but a renovator (*mujaddid*) of Islam.<sup>124</sup> His task is to clearly define what is the Prophetic Islam, to distinguish it from the ideas and practices which are clearly opposed to Islam, or which go by the name of Islam, but do not belong to it. His mission is to review these unIslamic and anti-Islamic ideas and practices and expose their errors, and to defend the true beliefs, values, practices, and institutions of Islam.

I have discussed a part of Sirhindi's work in the first chapter. The other part is concerned with problems that Sufi thought and practice have raised. This is the special field of Sirhindi's renovatory work; here he claims to have made a solid and unique contribution. This book is in a way a vindication of this claim. The first part of his work has a local relevance; it is important in the context of the Indian subcontinent. But the relevance of the second work is not limited to India; it concerns the whole Islamic world, and affects the entire religious life and thought of Islam. Sirhindi's contribution in this field should be viewed in this perspective. Seen in this context, his claim that he is the renovator of Islam at the end of its first and beginning of the second millennium, high-sounding though it is, is nevertheless substantially true.

Sirhindi's other claim is about his *walāyat*. This is what I propose to discuss here. In one of the letters<sup>125</sup> which Sirhindi wrote to his preceptor he described his spiritual experiences and said that he passed through the stages of 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān, 'Umar 1-Fārūq and Abū Bakr 1-Siddīq, one after the other, and came to a stage of *māhibubiyah*, a little below the stage of the Prophet. When the opposition against Sirhindi increased (to which I have referred before),<sup>126</sup> this letter was made an object of criticism and a pretext for vilification against him. He was charged with claiming superiority over the great Companions of the Prophet, including Abū Bakr 1-Siddīq. Some modern writers<sup>127</sup> have also joined in the same chorus.

Sirhindi denied these charges. Firstly, he points out that he described the vision in a letter which he wrote to his preceptor, and he wrote this letter because it was his preceptor's order to keep him informed of his visions and experiences. This is the standard practice of the *tariqah*. He

### Sirhindi's Claims

Shaykh Ahmad has made two kind of claims. One that he is not merely a Sufi shaykh directing the aspirants in spiritual

had no other motive.<sup>128</sup> Secondly, the inference which is drawn from the vision is incorrect. He himself never understood the vision in that sense, nor did he entertain the belief for a single moment. On the contrary, he believed and stated in clear words more than once that the lowest of the Companions of the Prophet was greater than the greatest of the *awliyā'* of the Ummah. 'Even Wahshi, the killer of Hamzah, who embraced Islam later, is better than the great *tābi'i*, Uways 1-Qarni, famous for his devotions.'<sup>129</sup>

As for the vision, it signifies nothing more than that he participated to an extent in some of the qualities of the Companions he mentions, and shared for a while in God's blessings on them. So far as rising to their status and honour is concerned, neither he nor any wali can dream of that.<sup>130</sup> Those who charge Sirhindi with claiming to have attained the status and honour of the Companions on the basis of the vision, understand the vision literally with utter disregard of the nature and the meaning of the mystic vision, and do so in the face of a clear denial of that charge by Sirhindi. They insist on their understanding of the vision, and allege that Sirhindi has offered an unconvincing and lame excuse.

But it is not correct to interpret Sufi visions literally; one should try to see what their real purpose is, and what they want to convey through their symbolic language. I will here quote a few cases. When Wali Allāh visited Madinah before he embarked on his great programme of interpreting Prophetic truths in the language of his times and reviving the Prophetic life and society, he saw in a dream that the Prophet's grandsons, Hasan and Husayn presented his pen to him. Its nib was broken; they repaired it first, and then gave it to him.<sup>131</sup> The dream cannot be interpreted literally; the Prophet did not have a pen, he was not a writer; and if he had a pen nobody can rise up to his status so as to interpret Islam as he would do. The dream means, as Wali Allāh understood it, that he is being commissioned by the Prophet to revive his Islam: his truths, his words and his ways; and that he would have the blessings of the Prophet in doing that task. Wali Allāh's father, Shāh 'Abd 1-Rahim, saw in a vision that a number of people were running in order to have a glimpse of God. He was also running along with them.

When the time of 'Aṣr prayer came, they requested him to lead the prayer. When he had finished, he asked what were they running after? They said that they were going to see God. Shāh 'Abd 1-Rahim said: 'I am the one you have been looking for.' They got up, and shook hands with him. Commenting on this vision, Wali Allāh writes: 'Visions like this sometimes convey the good news that one will influence people with power bestowed by God; sometimes they herald the experience of unity (*tawḥid*).'<sup>132</sup>

There are many instances of such visions and dreams. I hope that these two will be sufficient to show that literal interpretation of visions and dreams is wrong. Sirhindi's vision does not mean what it apparently shows: it only tells that Sirhindi shares some qualities which mark the life of 'Uthmān, 'Umar and Abū Bakr, and that he would have a special favour from God that would in some sense resemble theirs. What those qualities are and what that special favour is, the vision does not indicate. But it would not be difficult to form an idea of it from the facts of his life, his works and attainment, which is consistent with his ideas and beliefs. To me this seems to be his effort to define the Prophet's way to God which these great Companions followed, to revise Sufism in that light, and serve Islam as they served it.

The Sufi way is based on *fanā'* and *baqā'* which involves ecstasy and intoxication. Even when the Sufi crosses the stage of pure union and enters the next higher stage of separation after union, he is not completely free from intoxication. Sufis who are known for sobriety (*ṣaḥw*), such as Junayd and al-Suhrawardi, have not been completely free from intoxication. Sirhindi lists some words of Junayd which were spoken in that state: 'He is the knower (*al-'ārif*) and He is the known (*al-ma'rūf*'); 'The colour of water is the colour of the glass' and 'When the contingent is united with the Eternal, no trace of it is left.'<sup>133</sup> About Shaykh 1-Suhrawardi he says: 'The author of the 'Awārif is one of the most sober Sufis, yet his book contains a number of words pronounced in intoxication. I would not like to mention them here; I have collected some of them elsewhere.'<sup>134</sup> Sirhindi does not rule out that possibility in his own case. In a letter he wrote: 'I am a direct disciple of God, and my

hand is a substitute for the hand of God. I am a disciple of Muhammad through a number of links . . . but I am a direct disciple of God with no links in between. Hence I am a disciple of Muhammad as well as his colleague, coming after him to the same feast. Even though I am an attendant, I have not come without an invitation. Though I am a dependant, I have a kind of independence; even though I am his follower, I share in his honour. . . . However, I share not as an equal; that is infidelity; I share as a servant shares with his master.<sup>135</sup> When he was questioned about this letter and his claim of partial independence from the Prophet, he explained the point at length.<sup>136</sup>

The substance of his explanation is that the spiritual development of a Sufi has two aspects: One, his effort to reach God following the path of the Shari'ah which the Prophet has defined; this is called *suluk*. The other is God's attention to the Sufi; He pulls the Sufi to Himself; this is called *jadhb*. The point of the claim is that in his spiritual development, his own effort even though it is there, is very insignificant in comparison to the preponderant pull of God. It resembles, in a sense, prophecy which is entirely a matter of God's favour, without any effort from the Prophet. The other point which Sirhindī hints at here and has stated elsewhere<sup>137</sup> more clearly, is that his *walāyat* is not an ordinary kind of *walāyat*, but one which in orientation and results is very close to the *walāyat* of the Prophet. It is sober and almost completely free from *shāfi*. It affirms that God is absolutely other; that man is a mere creature, having nothing in common with the Lord; and that the highest stage of man's progress is servanthood (*'ubūdiyah*) rather than union or oneness (*tawḥid*). The truths which have been revealed to him are in full agreement with the Prophetic Shari'ah, and his mission is to preach the Shari'ah and restore its rule on the pattern of the Prophet.

Sirhindī realises that the words which he has used are rather boastful. He admits in all humility that they are the product of *sukr*. To his disciples who were shocked<sup>138</sup> by such loud claims, coming particularly from a preacher of sobriety, he said that they should never think that all that he had said or written was completely free from intoxication.

Intoxication is a part of *walāyat*; even a Sufi known for his sobriety may often succumb to it. This is not, as he puts it, 'the first bottle which has been broken'; one can find such lapses in Junayd, al-Suhrawardi, and al-Jilāni. He goes on to advise them to put his words also on the scale of the Shari'ah, and accept that which is true. If they find something unexpected and discordant, they should not hasten to condemn him, but try to interpret his words in a sense consistent with the Shari'ah. But if they cannot do that they should regret it as a lapse.<sup>139</sup>

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *Wahdat 'l-Shuhūd*

*Tawhīd* as used in the Sufi literature means four different things. It means, first, faith and belief in the unity of God; second, discipline of the internal and external life in the light of that faith; third, experience of union and oneness with God; and fourth, a theosophy or philosophical construction of reality in the light of the mystical experience.

In the context of the Shari'ah, *tawhīd* means either the affirmation of God's unity or the ordering of life according to the demands of that affirmation as defined in the Shari'ah. Since the experience of union or oneness with God is not a part of the Prophetic way, we cannot look for *tawhīd* in the latter two senses in the Shari'ah. There is, however, a theological elucidation of the Prophetic faith, and insofar as it is a part of the Shari'ah, it can be compared with the theosophic view of *tawhīd*.

The common word in later Sufi literature for *tawhīd* in the third sense is *tawhīd shuhūdī*, which simply means the perception (*shuhūd*) of One Being in mystical experience. It is the unitive experience at its height. For *tawhīd* in the fourth sense, both the terms *tawhīd wujūdī* and *wahdat 'l-wujūd* are in common use. *Tawhīd* without the adjective *wujūdī* has also been used in the same sense. As the most elaborate and forceful formulation of the doctrine of *tawhīd wujūdī* or *wahdat 'l-wujūd* came at the hands of Ibn 1-'Arabī, the terms have been identified with his philosophy. There are, however, other formulations<sup>1</sup> of the doctrine.

Sirhindī explains the concepts of *tawhīd shuhūdī* and *tawhīd wujūdī* in these words:

*Tawhīd shuhūdī* is to see One Being; that is, in his perception the Sufi has nothing but One Being. *Tawhīd wujūdī*, on the other hand, is to believe that there is only One Being there, that other things are non-existent, and that in spite of their non-existence, they are the manifestations and appearances of One Being.<sup>2</sup>

*Tawhīd shuhūdī* is to see One Being, or to perceive nothing in existence but One Being. But the perception does not mean that other beings are not there; nor does it imply a belief that other things are non-existent. During the day we only see the sun, and don't see the stars. But we do not believe that the stars are not there.<sup>3</sup> *Tawhīd wujūdī*, on the other hand, is not only to see One Being, but also to believe that there is only One Being there, that nothing else is in existence. It is, of course, not to deny the existence of other beings: the world is not a delusion. It only means that things do not exist there as *other* beings. They exist only as the manifestation of One Being, such that there is only One Being in existence, not many.

Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy is an elaboration of two propositions: One, that there is only One Being there, and second, that other beings are not *other* beings, but only the appearances of One Being. Many scholars have studied and elucidated Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy; I have also stated the main concepts of his philosophy at another place.<sup>4</sup> I, therefore, propose to sketch the basic concepts of his philosophy here so that we may compare it with the philosophy of Sīrhīndī and understand the criticism which the latter directs against it.

#### Basic Concepts of Ibn 'l-'Arabi's *Wahdat i-Wujūd*

The first fundamental concept of Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy is that there is only One Being there, and nothing exists besides it. The Arabic term for Being is *wujūd*, which may also be rendered as existence. The distinction which people try to make in our times between being and existence is not made by Ibn 'l-'Arabi. To say that there is only One Being there means, according to Ibn 'l-'Arabi, that (i) all that exists

is One Being, (ii) that the One Being has no parts, and (iii) that it is neither more here nor less there. There is in existence nothing but One Being, absolutely indivisible and homogeneous.

Being, however, determines itself, and as a result of this self-determination (*ta'ayyun*) distinctions and differences emerge in Being and multiplicity proceeds from Unity. But in the process, Being neither divides nor rarifies itself. It is the same One Being which manifests in its entirety, here in one form and there in another form, without suffering division or rarification. Like an actor, it appears in different characters, under different names, performing different functions. Ibn 'l-'Arabi likens it to the appearance of the same thing now as water, now as ice, and now as steam or vapour.

Five broad stages in the process of self-determination of Being are generally listed. The Being prior to every self-determination is absolutely One (*Aḥad*; this stage of Being is designated as *Aḥadiyah*, Absolute Unity. The second stage is called *Wahdah* or Unicity, when internal distinctions emerge in Being. This happens when Being presents to itself from itself the ideas of all the things that are to appear in the world in future. These ideal prototypes of things are called *a'yān thābitah*; for they eternally subsist in the knowledge of Being. The next stage of self-determination is called *Wāhidiyah* or Unity when Being determines itself essentially in objects on the pattern of their ideal prototypes, the *a'yān thābitah*. Since in the process the *a'yān thābitah* do not themselves appear in the outer world leaving the knowledge or mind of Being, and remain as ever in the state of subsistence (*thubūt*), which as compared to existence is a state of relative non-being, Ibn 'l-'Arabi calls them *ma'dūm*, non-existent.

The next three stages are the particularised determinations of Being in souls called *ta'ayyun rūhi*, spiritual determination; in symbolic forms called *ta'ayyun mithlī*, symbolic determination; and lastly in bodies called *ta'ayyun jasadi*, corporeal determination. The existential determinations are finite in contrast to the ideal determination which is infinite.

Together the five stages of determination are known as *ḥadrāt khams*, the five presences of Being.

Being which determines itself in various forms is the Being of God. It cannot be other than God; for there are no two beings there. It follows that the being of God is the being of the world; the difference between them is ruled out for the same reason.

Since God and the world are one Being, the relation between God and the world cannot be the relation of a cause and effect, or the relation of the Creator and created as theologians believe, or the relation of the One and its emanations as neo-Platonic philosophers imagine. For all these relations of causation, creation and emanation imply dualism in varying degrees between God and the world, and contradict the fundamental truth that Being is one. Since these terms fail to convey the truth, Ibn 'l-Arabi employs the word *tajalli*, self-uncovering or self-revelation, to describe the relation between God and the world. He does not, however, refrain from using terms like creation (*khalq*) and Creator (*khāliq*), emanation (*faydān/ṣudūr*) and emanate (*sādir*), even causation; but he interprets them differently consistent with his basic thesis.

God is Being qualified with all the attributes and relations that emerge in Being in the process of self-determination. When Being presents to itself the *a'yān* of things, it is the knowledge of God or Being qualified with knowledge. The *a'yān* which are Being in its ideal determinations constituting the ideal world, are the object of God's knowledge. Similarly, when Being determines itself in the objects of the outer world, this is creation, and Being qualified with that act is God, the Creator. The objects, on the other hand, are Being in its finite existential forms, and constitute the created world at a particular time. Hence it is the same Being which is the Knower and the known, the Creator and the created. Being as Knower and Creator is God, and Being as known and created is the world. In other words, the same Being, one, indivisible and homogeneous, when seen from one side is God and when seen from the other side is the world.

The names (*asmā'*) of God are of three kinds: One kind

of names are negative (*sulūb*) like infinite, or have a negative meaning, like eternal and everlasting; for the former means that which has no beginning, and the latter means that which has no end. The second kind of names are relational (*nishbī{idāfī}*) like the First (*al-Awwāl*) and the Last (*al-Ākhir*), the Creator (*al-Khāliq*) and the Lord (*al-Rabb*). The third kind of names are those which appear to be derived from some presumed quality (*sifat*) in God, such as the Knowing (*al-'Alīm*), the Powerful (*al-Qadir*), the Seeing (*al-Baṣir*), etc.

So far as the first and the second kind of attributes are concerned, they are specific to God, and the world is qualified with their opposite or corresponding attributes. God is infinite, and the world is finite; and God is Creator and Lord, and the world is created and under His care and rule (*marbūb*). As for the third kind of attributes, they are not derived from some qualities in God over and above His Essence (*Dhāt*) as theologians believe. They refer only to a state of His Essence, of its being in a particular relation to some object. 'God is Knowing' means that the Divine Essence is in the state of the relation of knowing with an object that is known. But the Essence of God is nothing other than Being as such (*wujūd*) and the object is nothing other than Being in its finite determination. Hence 'God is Knowing' means that God/Being is in a state in which He is conscious of His own finite manifestation. That is, the Knower and the known are one. The same is true of 'God is Powerful', or 'God is Willing (*al-Murid*)' etc. What does the proposition 'man knows or wills' mean? Since man is a particular finite manifestation of Being or God, he knows or wills means that God knows or wills not as the infinite He is, but as God in one of His finite manifestations. The object of man's knowledge is either God or any manifestation of God. Hence the meaning of the proposition 'man knows', in the last analysis, is the same as the proposition 'God knows'. In either case the knower is God, whether God the infinite or God in His finite manifestation; and the object known is also the same, whether God as such or God in a determinate form.

The consequence of the doctrine of One Being (*wahdat*

*'l-wujūd*) as expounded by Ibn 'l-'Arabī is that the subject of every predicate is God, even if the apparent subject is something different, a human or a non-human being. God is the knower and the known, the powerful and the object of power, the willing and the willed, the mover and the moved, etc. God is also the doer of all acts, good or bad, the holder of every belief, right or wrong, and the one who undergoes every experience, pleasurable or painful. He is also the acts, ideas and experiences which are done, believed or experienced.

God is immanent as well as transcendent. He is immanent insofar as He is one with the world; and He is one with the world in being (*wujūd*) as well as all the attributes, acts and experiences of beings in the world – believing and knowing, willing and doing, enjoying and suffering – of which He is the real subject. He is transcendent insofar as He is different from the world; and He is different from the world only in the attributes which He does not share with the world such as His infinitude and eternity, creation and lordship, rule and guidance, etc.

Ibn 'l-'Arabī and his followers cite the Qur'ānic verse: 'You did not throw (a handful of dust) when you threw, it is God who threw',<sup>6</sup> and similar other verses in support of their doctrine of One Actor. But there is no argument for them in the Qur'ān. This verse, for instance, does not at all deny the action of the Prophet; it only denies that the effects on the enemy ranks following his act were really produced by it. It wants to underscore that the real cause was not the act of the Prophet but the act of God operating with the Prophet's act. We should understand the verse as we understand the hadīth of the Prophet: 'He has no faith who violates the trust.'<sup>7</sup> It is obvious that the Prophet does not mean that one who violates the trust has no faith, and is a real infidel; he only means to say that his faith is weak and ineffective. Just as the hadīth denies only the effectiveness of the faith, not the faith itself, similarly the verse denies the effectiveness of the Prophet's act, not the act itself.

Those who believe in *wahdat 'l-wujūd* usually try to interpret the Qur'ān and the Sunnah in the light of their doctrine. But the more thoughtful among them do not approve of this move and abstain from it. Wali Allāh (d. 1176/1762), for instance, who believes in the basic doctrines of *wahdat 'l-wujūd* in a slightly modified form,

says:

One who interprets the words of the prophets on the lines of *wahdat 'l-wujūd*, does not know them, nor their ways.<sup>8</sup>

At another place he distinguishes between the natural language (*tawr 'l-fitrak*) of the common man, and philosophical or ontological language of *wahdat 'l-wujūd*, and says that the prophets speak in the former language and never indulge in the latter.<sup>9</sup>

Sirhindī's second observation on Ibn 'l-'Arabī's *wahdat 'l-wujūd* is that it conflicts with many a fundamental principle of Islam. It provides, for instance, a justification for idolatry. Since the philosophy identifies the world with God, the worship of any object is the worship of God provided it is worshipped as a manifestation of God.<sup>10</sup> This is what the idol worshippers normally believe. Secondly, the doctrine denies that there is anything really evil. As a manifestation

### Sirhindī's Criticism of *Wahdat 'l-Wujūd*

Sirhindī's first observation of this doctrine of *tawhīd wujūdī* is that it is not the *tawhīd* of the prophets.<sup>5</sup> The prophets do not teach that the Being is one; they only teach that God is one. They do not say that nothing exists besides God; they only say that there is no god besides Allah. Contrary to Ibn 'l-'Arabī's *tawhīd wujūdī*, they teach that the world exists there, that it is other than God and different from Him, that God shares nothing with the world and transcends it completely. The prophetic religion is based, Sirhindī says, on the premise of duality (*iθnayniyat*) rather than the identity of God and the world. It separates the creation from the Creator, the servant from the Lord, and never says that the Creator is the created, or the Lord is the servant. Prophets do not deny knowledge, will, power, action and experience to man or other beings and predicate them to God alone. They do not say that there is only One Actor or One Subject or only One Being there.

of God, the Absolute Good, everything in existence is good; it is evil only in relation to something other than itself. Even heresy and infidelity are not evil; in fact they are good in themselves, and bad or less good only in comparison to faith and Islam.<sup>11</sup> This is to contradict the mission of the prophets and discourage preaching and proselitisation.<sup>12</sup>

*Wahdat 'l-wujūd* involves the belief that God is the Only Actor. Since there are not two Beings, there are not two wills. Whatever is chosen or done by anyone is in fact chosen and done by God. This belief in the One Actor (*tawhīd fi'lī*) is a product, Sirhindi says, of intoxication. It spells determinism (*jabriyyat*)<sup>13</sup> and negates human responsibility. Sirhindi also charges *wahdat 'l-wujūd* with attributing all kinds of mistaken beliefs and evil acts to God,<sup>14</sup> putting constraints on His freedom,<sup>15</sup> and asserting the eternity of some souls.<sup>16</sup>

Shaykh Sirhindi's third observation is that the belief in One Being is a subjective phenomenon. The proof of its subjectivity lies in the genesis of the idea. There are two ways in which the belief arises. Some Sufis begin with *a priori* belief in the idea. They understand or are asked to understand the *kalimah*: 'There is no god except Allah', to mean that 'there is no existent except Allah'. They repeat the *kalimah* and contemplate over it. As a result of a 'prolonged meditation and reflection', Sirhindi says, 'the idea dominates their mind, and after constant repetition of the *kalimah* it is established in their imagination'.<sup>17</sup> They come to see in vision what they had already believed on some ground.

Other Sufis acquire belief in the Unity of Being by way of love. 'They begin with *dhikr* and contemplation which is free from the idea of One Being, then reach the stage of the heart (*maqām-i-qalb*) by their own effort or by the sheer grace of God, and get completely absorbed in the love of God. If at this stage they behold the beauty of One Being, it is on account of their burning love for God which removes everything from their vision and hides. As beings other than God are removed from their vision and hidden, and as they see or experience nothing but God, they do not recognise that other things exist. This belief in One Being (*tawhīd*) is

a matter of feeling (*hāl*) and is free from the influence of thought and imagination.'<sup>18</sup>

Whether the belief in One Being is the result of constant repetition of the *kalimah* or a profound love of God, it happens at a particular stage of the Sufi's *suluk*. When the Sufi advances, his experience of oneness is replaced by the experience of separation, which gradually deepens, and the Sufi sees that God is not at all one with the world, but completely different and absolutely other.

Sirhindi's fourth observation on *wahdat 'l-wujūd* is that it is a new development in the history of Sufism. No one before Ibn 'l-Arabi talked of it. The *tawhīd* which the Sufis during the two hundred years before him speak of is *tawhīd shuhūdī*<sup>19</sup> rather than *tawhīd wujūdi*.

This observation is on the whole correct. The forerunners of Sufism, like Ibrahīm ibn Adham<sup>20</sup> (d. 160/777) and Fudayl ibn 'Iyād<sup>21</sup> (d. 187/803) were ascetics and devotees (*zāhid* and 'ābid) rather than Sufis. Sufism properly begins with men of the succeeding generation like Dhū 'l-Nūn 'l-Misrī<sup>22</sup> (d. 246/861) and Abū Yazid 'l-Bistāmī<sup>23</sup> (d. 261/875) and Abū Sa'id 'l-Kharrazī<sup>24</sup> (d. 277/890) who experienced *fārā* and *baqā'*, union and separation. They talked of the *tarīqah* which they followed and described the experiences which they had. But they did not tell what the experience meant to them, and did not reflect on the nature of the human soul, God and the world.<sup>25</sup> Speculation on the soul and God, perhaps begins with Junayd (d. 297/909); the *tawhīd* which he seems to have developed is the *tawhīd fi'lī*, that is, the doctrine that God is the only Actor, and no one else does anything.<sup>26</sup> Al-Hallāj (d. 309/922) talks of different things; at times the absolute transcendence<sup>27</sup> of God, at times His incarnation,<sup>28</sup> and at times His oneness<sup>29</sup> with the world. Al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) asserts that being is one, but he does not subscribe to the second proposition of Ibn 'l-Arabi's *wahdat 'l-wujūd* that the objects of the world are the manifestations of One Being in the sense that Ibn 'l-Arabi does.<sup>30</sup> Abū 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī (d. 561/1166) and Shihāb 'l-Dīn 'l-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234), as we have noted before, have no interest<sup>31</sup> in speculation. Ibn 'l-Fārid's *tawhīd*, as Professor Nicholson observes, is *tawhīd shuhūdī*<sup>22</sup> rather than *tawhīd*

*wujūdī*. Hence, Sirhindī's observation that *wahdat l-wujūd* came into being with Ibn 'l-'Arabi is essentially true.<sup>33</sup>

Sirhindī's final observation on *wahdat l-wujūd* is that this belief is not required for *fānā*. *Tawhīd shuhūdī* is sufficient for attaining *fānā* and realising real sincerity (*ikhlās*) which is the purpose of Sufi *sulūk*. 'For *fānā*', Sirhindī says, 'we only need the perception of One Being (*tawhīd shuhūdī*) so that we can forget the not-Divine (*mā siwā Allāh*)'. About *tawhīd wujūdī* he observes: 'It is just possible that a Sufi makes his *sayr* and travels from one end to the other without getting the ideas of the Unity of Being. He might even doubt that they occur at all. To me the way in which none of these ideas happen is the shorter way to the goal than the way in which they happen. Moreover, the travellers on the former path normally reach the goal, whereas the travellers on the latter path often go astray. They satisfy themselves with a few drops and leave the river, run after union with a shadow and leave reality. I have learned this truth from my own experience.'<sup>34</sup>

### *Wahdat l-Shuhūd*

Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī not only differentiated the Prophetic *tawhīd* from the *tawhīd wujūdī* of Ibn 'l-'Arabi and showed that the latter was incompatible with the former, he also attempted to formulate a philosophy based upon the ultimate Sufi experience of Divine transcendence which would be compatible with the religion of the Prophet. This philosophy is commonly known as *wahdat l-shuhūd* or *tawhīd shuhūdī*, Unity of Being in vision; for it asserts that the Unity of Being which the Sufis perceive at the stage of union is only a matter of subjective perception (*shuhūd*). Beyond this negative connotation the term offers no positive indication of the nature of Sirhindī's philosophy. I have discussed his philosophy at length elsewhere;<sup>35</sup> here I propose to outline the main concepts.

The most fundamental concept of Sirhindī's philosophy is that God is completely different from the world and absolutely other. The world is in no sense one with God, certainly

not in existence (*wujūd*). God is one being, and the world is another, and the two beings have nothing in common.

Sirhindī is not unaware of the fact that Ibn 'l-'Arabi does not completely identify the world with God, that he maintains a kind of difference between them, and affirms a relative transcendence for God. But he believes that this difference is peripheral and very inadequate. In *wahdat l-wujūd* the identity is fundamental; it is the same one indivisible, homogeneous being which is God as well as the world. Sirhindī denies this postulate of fundamental oneness and asserts that the world is one being and God is another being, that the existence of God is not the existence of the world.

As God is absolutely other and completely different from the world, the fundamental truth is not monism of being, but dualism. This is what follows from Sirhindī's basic thesis of difference. People have characterised his philosophy as dualism (*iḥmāniyyat*),<sup>36</sup> and he himself does not shy away from the term. He, however, says that this dualism is not ultimate; for, although the world is not one with God (*hama 'ūst*), it proceeds from God (*hama az 'ūst*). Secondly, the existence of the world is not comparable to Divine existence: God's existence is real whereas the existence of the world is imaginary (*khayālī*) and unreal (*mawhūm*). Hence, as existing in the real sense there is only one Being there: God; the world does not exist. Sirhindī would have no objection to calling his doctrine *wahdat l-wujūd*, provided one understands it in his sense.

Ibn 'l-'Arabi and Sirhindī agree on the proposition that there is in reality only one Being there, namely God. Their difference begins on the question as to how the world is related to God. Ibn 'l-'Arabi believes that God's existence is identical with the existence of the world: there is One All-inclusive Existence which seen from one angle is God and seen from another angle is the world. God is both immanent and transcendent: immanent, because God's existence is the existence of the world, there is only One Being there; and transcendent, because while God is Being in its infinitude, the world is Being in its finite manifestations. Sirhindī, on the other hand, believes that God's existence is not identical with the existence of the world. God excludes

the world, rather than includes it as Ibn 'l-'Arabi thinks. Yet the existence of the world beside God does not contradict the truth that in reality there is only One Being there, God. For the existence of the world is an imaginary existence, and the presence of an unreal image by no means threatens the unity of the Real Being.

Sirhindi explains this most crucial idea like this: The presence of the world is like the presence of an image of an object in a mirror. There is no comparison between the presence of an image and the existence of the object. The object is there at a distance before the mirror. On the other hand, the image, though it appears to be behind the mirror you do not see it there. Nor is the image in the mirror. Therefore, the image is not in the space (*khārij*) in which the object is. Many other properties associated with the object are also not found in the image. Hence, the presence of the image is not the existence of the object: the existence of the object is real existence in the real space, whereas the existence of the image is an unreal existence, only in perception (*hiss*) and imagination (*wahm*), located in shadow space (*khārij zillī*). The existence of the image, therefore, is a shadow existence (*wujūd zillī*), completely different and separate from the real existence (*wujūd ashī*) of the object. The existence of the world is similarly a shadow existence, different and separate from the real existence of God. And as the presence of the image does not entitle us to say that there are two objects there, similarly the presence of the world does not justify the assertion that there is a duality of being, a world existing besides God.

Sirhindi explains the shadowy, non-real status of the world through his concept of non-being ('*adam*), not found in Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy. When the latter speaks of '*adam*', he means by it the non-existence in the outer world of the *a'yān thābitah*, the ideal prototypes of things, eternally subsisting in Being. In Sirhindi's philosophy, non-being ('*adam*) has a completely different connotation. It is a principle of great significance; it plays in his thought a role similar to what matter plays in neo-Platonism, or nescience (*avidyā*) in Shankar's Vedanta.

The world is a determination not of Being, as Ibn 'l-'Arabi

thinks, but of its opposite non-being with a reflection (*zill*) of God's being on it. The knowledge that we have in a particular object is not the determination of God's knowledge, but of its opposite ignorance with a reflection (*zill*) of God's knowledge on it; similarly the power of an object is not the determination of God's power, but the determination of its opposite impotency with a reflection (*zill*) of God's power on it; and so on with other attributes. The same is true of the essence of an object: it is a determination of non-being with a reflection (*zill*) of God's being on it. The important thing that has to be noted in this regard is that the *zill* of a thing is not the thing itself, as Ibn 'l-'Arabi and his followers believe.<sup>37</sup> The *zill* of an object is different from the object numerically as well as qualitatively. This is very crucial.

These two fundamental departures from Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy, namely that things are essentially determinations of non-being and that the reflections of Being that sustain these non-beings are numerically and qualitatively different from Being and its attributes, make Sirhindi's philosophy altogether different. For instance, the ideas of things, the *a'yān thābitah*, in Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy are determinations of Being in knowledge. But in Sirhindi's philosophy they are the combination of particular non-beings like ignorance and impotency with the shadows of God's knowledge and power. That is why Sirhindi avoids calling them *a'yān thābitah*, and refers to them as *haqā'iq mumkināt*, the essences of contingent beings. Creation according to Ibn 'l-'Arabi means the existence of Being in the outer world in determinate forms on the pattern of the *a'yān thābitah*. But in Sirhindi's view, creation is the appearance of the contingent essences with a shadow of God's existence in the shadow space (*khārij zilli*) of the world.

The world in Sirhindi's view is in essence non-being, non-existing and unreal. What imparts to it a shadow-existence, a semblance of reality, and elevates it from absolute nothingness and gives it a permanence and stability, is the reflection of God's existence and attributes on it. It is like an object of magic which seems to exist in the world, but in reality exists only in vision and imagination. Just as a magical

creation is unreal, but not absolutely illusory, so is the world unreal, but not a mere phantasy. The difference between a magical object and an object of the world is only that while the former is unstable and momentary, the latter, because it is the creation of God, has got a permanence and stability enough to be the basis of life in this world and the next. It is, in short, both unreal and real, a non-real reality.

The relative stability which God has bestowed on this unreal world has given it an identity of its own different from God, an identity at a level that cannot oppose God's unity. The objects of the world have a power and a personality of their own, and man has a will, a power and a personality. Sirhindī neither denies causality in nature nor freedom of will in man. He denies only their self-sufficiency and independence. The beliefs, actions and experiences of man are his own, not of God; though they are in virtue of the knowledge and power He has bestowed on him and operate within the limits He has imposed. Of these beliefs, actions and responses, some are good and right, and one will be rewarded for them; and some are wrong, and one is responsible for them, and liable for punishment.

The second difficulty that one encounters is that Sirhindī's ideas keep on changing. Although he did not take much time to traverse all the stages of mystic experience, he had to wait for years and years<sup>38</sup> till he could work those insights into a philosophical doctrine. A third and often baffling difficulty is posed by his terminology. It was originally developed by Ibn 1-'Arabī in order to expound his own vision. When Sirhindī used it to express a fundamentally different vision of reality, quite naturally it gave rise to confusion.

In outlining the two systems I have tried to clear up some of the confusion. I have tried to show, for instance, what Ibn 1-'Arabī means by saying that Being (*wujūd*) is one, and what Sirhindī means by the same proposition. I have also referred to the difference in their views on the nature of the *a'yān thābitah*, or, the ideas of things before creation, and on creation itself. Another instance is the way they speak of the status of the world. Both characterise it as shadow (*zill*), non-existing (*ma'dūm*) and illusory (*mawhūm*). But they understand by these terms completely different things. When Ibn 1-'Arabī calls the world *zill*, what he means is that it exists as a manifestation of God, and not by itself. He clearly denies that it is other than God, or that it is a lower order of reality. But when Sirhindī calls the world *zill*, he not only means that it depends on God for its existence, but also that it is an altogether different being, separate from God and a completely lower order of reality, almost a non-entity.

Similarly, when Ibn 1-'Arabī says that the world is non-existing (*ma'dūm*) what he means is that the essences of the object, namely, their ideal prototypes (*a'yān thābitah*) which are the ideal determinations of Being, remain eternally in the state of subsistence (*thubūt*) in the mind of God, and have no existence in the outer world. What exists there is God Himself on the pattern of those ideal essences. On the other hand, when Sirhindī says that the world is *ma'dūm*, he means that the objects of the world in their essence are determinations of non-being with only a reflection of God's attributes, and exist in the outer world by virtue of a reflection of God's existence at a level which in comparison to God's existence is a level of non-existence.

Likewise when Ibn 1-'Arabī says that the world is imagi-

### Difference Between *Wahdat i-Wujūd* and *Wahdat i-Shuhūd*

The difference between Ibn 1-'Arabī's philosophy and that of Sirhindī is substantial and fundamental. But for some reason that difference has not been fully appreciated. Sirhindī is partly responsible for it. He chooses to spell out his philosophy in letters that he wrote to different men at different times. This medium though effective in other matters, is quite unsuitable for sustained discussion, least of all a philosophical exposition. He gives an outline of his system in one letter, develops a concept in a second, and another in a third; treats an issue partly here and partly there; and makes some important points in letters which are devoted essentially to other subjects. Hence one has to extract all the relevant passages from the three big volumes of his *Collected Letters* before one can begin to form an idea of his philosophy.

nary (*khayāl*) and illusory (*mawhūm*), he means that the world of common belief as an entity existing in itself separately from God is nothing but a creation of imagination and an illusion. The reality is that it is one with God, in a sense distinct but essentially the same; it is God existing in His determinate forms. On the other hand, when Sirhindī says that the world is imaginary and illusory, he means that the world exists separately from God, but it exists not with a real existence like that of God, but with an unreal existence like that of an image in a mirror or an object of magic in imagination and vision. It is an appearance without a reality (*numūd-i-bi būd*), like the appearance of a circle created by a fast-moving burning point which seems to exist although it does not exist.<sup>39</sup>

These problems are inherent in Sirhindī's work, and make the understanding of his philosophy very difficult. But they are not formidable, and can be overcome by patiently working through his writings. But much more difficult are the problems which have been created by scholars who owe allegiance to both Ibn 'l-'Arabī and Sirhindī. They are not prepared to admit that these great masters of Sufism would differ on fundamentals; consequently they overlook and underplay their differences.

The most outstanding example of this approach is that of Wali Allāh (d. 1176/1762). He has a great admiration for Ibn 'l-'Arabī, and believes that the basic doctrines of *wahdat l-wujūd* are correct. Only on one point does he feel unhappy: he thinks that *wahdat l-wujūd* as commonly interpreted does not do justice to God's transcendence.<sup>40</sup> This defect may, however, be removed, he thinks, by reinterpreting some concepts.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, he has also a great respect for Sirhindī. He was trained in his *tariqah*, and appreciated many of the ideas which he had explicated, as we have seen before. It is difficult for him to see that the revelations of the two great masters of Sufism should essentially differ. Moreover, if that is really the case, it would jeopardise the value of mystical *kashf* and experience. Hence they have to be essentially the same and their difference has to be peripheral.<sup>42</sup>

With this presumption Wali Allāh starts to reconcile<sup>43</sup> the

two doctrines. At the outset he disposes of Sirhindī's doctrine of non-being as nothing (*lā shay'*),<sup>44</sup> which amounts to the rejection of one of the two fundamental concepts of Sirhindī's philosophy. His second fundamental concept is *zill*, or shadow; Wali Allāh dismisses it as a metaphor.<sup>45</sup> After rejecting these two concepts, he does not experience much difficulty in showing that the two systems are in essence the same. Minor issues such as the concept of Divine attributes on which Sirhindī differs from Ibn 'l-'Arabī, naturally pale into insignificance. As for the critical observations of Sirhindī on *wahdat l-wujūd*, Wali Allāh completely ignores them. He seems to be under the impression that once *wahdat l-wujūd* is interpreted as he suggests, the objections will disappear. I have discussed elsewhere Wali Allāh's attempt to reinterpret<sup>46</sup> *wahdat l-wujūd*. I do not think that it makes any significant difference.

Wali Allāh's effort to show that Sirhindī's philosophy is essentially the same as that of Ibn 'l-'Arabī, and the difference is insignificant or linguistic, was forcefully counteracted by the leaders of the mainstream of Sirhindī's followers. With the blessings of Mirzā Mazhar Jān-i-Jānān<sup>47</sup> (d. 1195/1780), the chief leader of the *Mujaddidiyah* of his time, one of his disciples, Shāh Ghulām 'Alī Yahyā (d. 1190/1776) wrote a treatise, *Kalimat l-Haqq*<sup>48</sup> or the *Word of Truth* in which he stated Sirhindī's philosophy, highlighted the points on which it differed from the philosophy of Ibn 'l-'Arabī, and disparaged Wali Allāh's effort to underplay them. This candid repudiation of Wali Allāh's reconciliation between the two doctrines provoked, on the one hand, a furious refutation of the *Word of Truth* under the title *Destruction of Untruth (Damgh l-Bāti)*<sup>49</sup> by his son Shāh Rafī' 'l-Dīn (d. 1247/1833) and, on the other, a better appreciation of Sirhindī's doctrines and its difference from Ibn 'l-'Arabī's philosophy, by a grandson of Wali Allāh, Shāh Ismā'īl (d. 1246/1830). The philosophy which Shāh Ismā'īl has developed in his *'Abaqāt*<sup>50</sup> is a more successful effort to rehabilitate Sirhindī's transcendentalism with the concepts of Ibn 'l-'Arabī.

## Conclusion – Perimeters of Islamic Sufism

From the discussion of Shaykh Ahmad's ideas in these pages, the perimeters of a Sufism, working within the bounds of the Sharī'ah and consistent with its principles and values, are hopefully clear. We would sum up the discussion and the main points below.

Sufism is an effort to reaffirm the vision of reality which the Revelation of the Prophet has defined. It is meant not to unravel the mysteries of the world and life, or attain a new enlightenment and illumination, but to seek a clear insight and strong conviction into the truths of Revelation, without attempting to change or modify them.

The vision of reality which Revelation upholds is in essentials clear and defined. Sirhindī believes that the Prophet has stated the fundamental truths very clearly, and has not left it to the reason of a philosopher or the *kashf* of a mystic to tell what these truths are, or what they really mean. I will state here some of these truths which, Sirhindī believes, constitute the Prophetic vision.

The Revelation of the Prophet holds that the objects of the world exist in themselves, that they have attributes and properties, and that they move, act and react. These attributes, movements, actions and reactions are theirs, not of God. God creates the objects and their attributes; but He is not the subject of their attributes. He creates their movement, their action and reaction; but He is not the one who moves, nor the one who acts and reacts. Revelation asserts that things are good and bad, perfect and imperfect, beautiful

and ugly according to standards applicable to them. They are subjects of these predicates, not God.

Revelation separates man as it separates the world from God. Man has an identity of his own: his ideas and beliefs, his will and action, and his feelings and experience, all are his. God creates man, and his ideas, will, action and feelings. But He is only their creator; He is not the one who believes his ideas, makes his choices, performs his actions, enjoys his pleasures or suffers his pains.

Revelation calls some beliefs of man true, and some false, some acts right and some wrong, some attributes good and some bad. It asserts that men are responsible for their beliefs, actions and attitudes; and that God will judge them, reward what is right and good, and punish what is wrong and evil. It declares that God knows in advance what man thinks, does or experiences. It nevertheless holds that the foreknowledge of God, His pre-ordination or creation do not negate the power and freedom that God has given man, nor undermine his responsibility for beliefs, actions and attitudes insofar as he is responsible. It rejects as mistaken and irresponsible the move of the people to shift their responsibility to God on these accounts.<sup>1</sup> Revelation does not recognise that God's control of nature and rule over history, or His decree regarding man's life and destiny, faith and infidelity, righteousness and wickedness, happiness and misery, conflict with His will to send prophets, define what is true faith and right behaviour, and command man to believe in His guidance and comply with His law. Revelation does not oppose God's incontrovertible lordship and eternal decree (*qadr*) to His guidance and command (*amr*).

Revelation likewise separates God from the world. Nothing in the world participates in God's essence, attributes, powers and authority. God exists by Himself; the world exists by Him. He is Infinite, Eternal and Everlasting; He is Omnipotent, Creator, Ruler and Lord. Nothing shares in any of these attributes. He is Perfect and Holy; everything else is imperfect and defective. He holds all power, confers every blessing, and merits all praise. He commands extreme reverence, perfect worship, absolute

submission and unqualified love. No one shares these excellences, powers and rights.

Revelation attributes many things to man and the world that it attributes to God, such as existence, knowledge, will, power and action. But it makes clear that they do not have them of themselves; everything is given by God, created and controlled by Him. It also makes clear that these attributes when compared with God's attributes pale into insignificance. However great they might be, they cannot elevate the status of their subjects. They are God's creation, in His full control and at His service. No one can participate in His divinity, nor share in the authority and the rights that divinity commands. And this creaturely status of theirs is permanent and inalienable: they are to remain as creature and servant for ever.

These are the clear truths (*muhkamāt*) of Revelation and make up its vision of Divine transcendence. When Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi says that the Prophetic religion is based on the principle of dualism (*iḥnayniyat*), he means this transcendence. He is aware that Revelation also states that God is the First and the Last, the Manifest and the Hidden; that He comprehends everything; that He is with everyone and everywhere; and that He is closer to us than our jugular vein. But never does it oppose, he points out, these allegorical (*muṭashābih*) truths to the clear ones (*muhkamāt*); on the contrary, it censures any interpretation of the former that conflicts with the latter as 'perversity of the heart'.<sup>2</sup>

Islamic theology has upheld the primacy of Divine transcendence and interpreted allegorical truths in a way as not to contradict or compromise it. Sufism has to follow suit. It has to affirm God's transcendence as Revelation has defined.

Drawing upon its experiences, visions and intuitions, it cannot oppose the *mutashābihāt* to the *muhkamāt* of Revelation. If it does, it is anything but Islamic.

The Qur'ān certainly refers to super-rational ways of

knowledge, and extra-ordinary means of Divine communica-

tion and guidance other than Revelation. But it does not

specifically mention the mystic experience of union, *fānā'*

and *baqā'*. The Prophet was not aware of it, he did not teach

or practise it. His Companions did not know of it either.

This fact is clearly stated by Shaykh Ahmad and Shah Wali Allāh; and 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī tacitly endorses it.<sup>3</sup> Even if it is supposed that the unitive experience is included in the extra-ordinary ways of knowledge which are referred to in the Qur'ān, there is no ground to believe that it yields an authority to modify or change the truths of Revelation.

Mystic experience is not an independent source of knowing reality. It is not self-validating; its revelations have to be validated with reference to the Prophetic Revelation. The Qur'ān recognises no experience as self-authenticating besides the *wāḥy* of the Prophet, and makes no mention of the unitive experience of the mystic. Moreover, the unitive experience is only the first stage of the mystical experience; there are two further stages: difference in union, and absolute difference. Therefore, the revelations of the unitive experience are at best transitional truths which are superseded later by the truths of transcendence which the Sufi ultimately realises. Finally the truths which are received at the unitive stage vary from one Sufi to another. To Junayd at that stage, the experience of union is an experience of One Will or One Actor; to al-Ghazālī and Ibn 'l-'Arabī, it is the experience of One Being. But what al-Ghazālī means by One Being is completely different from what Ibn 'l-'Arabī understands by it. Al-Ghazālī takes it to mean that God alone exists in the real sense, and the world does not exist at all in that sense. He does not identify God with the world or consider the world as a manifestation of God as Ibn 'l-'Arabī does. He rather imagines the relation between God and the world on the pattern of the soul and the body.<sup>4</sup> Ibn 'l-'Arabī denies every dualistic conception, be it of Junayd or al-Ghazālī, and asserts a completely non-dualistic Unity of Being, by identifying God with the world and reducing the world to a determination of God. He, however, takes determination as an inalienable part of reality, whereas other seers of *wāḥdat 'l-wujūd* may regard it a subjective consideration.<sup>5</sup>

Mystic experience has no better authority than the reason of the theologian. None is competent to provide a knowledge of reality independent of Revelation. They have a humble function to perform: to interpret and explicate Revelation.

In this capacity, mystic experience is further subject to theological reason. It cannot overrule the truths which the theologians of Islam have established by deriving them from the Revelation. Sirhindī is definitely of the view that mystic revelations have to conform to the Revelation of the Prophet as well as to the doctrine on which the theologians concur. Other Sufis have not stated this point; but it is difficult for anyone to hold a different view, if he takes into consideration all that has been noted above regarding the efficacy of mystic experience.

That the mystic experience has no authority to modify or change the Prophetic vision of reality is hardly a matter of dispute among the Sufis. But opinions have differed as to whether a particular view of reality developed in the light of the mystic experience contradicts the Prophetic vision and conflicts with its truths. Sirhindī firmly believes that Ibn 'l-'Arabī's doctrine of *wāḥdat 'l-wujūd* has no basis in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, that it contravenes God's transcendence, and conflicts with various truths of the vision which Revelation upholds. He maintains that the doctrine was first expounded by Ibn 'l-'Arabī, and that the Sufis before him did not believe in it. When they spoke of *tawhīd* they spoke of their *perception* of One Being (*tawhīd shuhūdī*); and one would not be justified in inferring from their words that they believed that Being is One. Many of them are known to have crossed their unitive stage, and regretted their earlier words of unity with God. Other Sufis may also have passed that stage, though we do not know that for sure.

Those who have expounded the doctrine of *wāḥdat 'l-wujūd* are the ones who did not rise above the unitive stage, or the ones who did rise but could not rise enough and separate God clearly from the world. Ibn 'l-'Arabī belongs to this second group. His philosophy reflects his experience because he takes identity of the world and God as the fundamental truth and treats their difference as relative. A number of Sufis have followed Ibn 'l-'Arabī and accepted his doctrine without reservation. However, some have felt that as usually elaborated the doctrine compromises<sup>6</sup> to some extent God's transcendence; consequently they have attempted to reinterpret some concepts to make it more consistent.

A number of Sufis who believe in *wahdat i-wujūd* believe only in its fundamental thesis, and do not commit themselves to many of Ibn 'l-Arabi's ideas which conflict with the Sharī'ah. Some of them do not consider them an essential part of the doctrine, and ignore them; others interpret them; and a number of them only care for the fundamentals and avoid entering into the details. The number of Sufis who accept Ibn 'l-Arabi's philosophy with all the ideas he has worked out and the inferences he has drawn are far less than is generally believed.

There is besides, a large group of Sufis which includes most of the founders of the Sufi *tariqahs*, such as 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilāni, Shihāb 'l-Suhrawardi, Bahā' 'l-Dīn Naqshband, and many of the leading figures of these *tariqahs*, who have kept away from *wahdat i-wujūd* as well as any other theosophical doctrine. For them the value of mystical experience, unitive or differentiative is not cognitive, but practical. It purifies the will rather than unveils reality; it is a part of the training to discard one's own desires and wishes, and pursue the will of God, for no end other than to please Him.

Though the Sufis are divided on the issue of *wahdat i-wujūd*, they are unanimous in condemning the doctrine of *hulūl* or the incarnation of God or any of His powers in the world as a whole or a part of it, whether man or any other being. They may dispute whether Husayn ibn Mansūr or any other Sufi believed in the doctrine of *hulūl* in any form, but none of them would deny that the doctrine contradicts God's transcendence and repudiates the Islamic principle of *tawhīd*. They would also not rule out that the mystic experience of union may at times lead a Sufi to speak in terms which suggest *hulūl*, and involve a belief in it.

*Tawhīd fi'lī*, or the idea that there is only one Actor there, God, that no one possesses any power, and no one wills or acts, has been quite welcome to most Sufis. Many of them have a similar attitude towards what is called *tawhīd sifātī*, or the idea that not only will, but also the other attributes of man refer in fact to God. More than the sole Actor performing every action which anybody does, God is the only Subject of every attribute which is predicated of any

being. To most of the Sufis, *tawhīd fi'lī* or *tawhīd sifātī* are two stages of their *sulūk*, and refer to their feeling (*hāl*) or perception (*shuhūd*). But the Sufis who believe in *wahdat i-wujūd*, take them more than as an experience; they believe in its reality. Sirhindī does not object if one takes them as experience, but he censures belief in it. His remark about *tawhīd fi'lī* as a belief is that it is the gateway to blasphemy (*zandaqah*).<sup>7</sup> Both the *wahdat i-wujūd*, and are the main reason why Sirhindī condemns the doctrine.

Sufism is to help man realise the purpose he has been created for. Revelation says that man is the servant of God, and the purpose of his life is to serve God. Sufism is to help man realise deeply and intensely the truth that he is a servant of God, and nothing more. Sufism is also to help man be a true and perfect servant of God. This is the end and the goal of Sufism. Beyond this goal there is no goal; servanthood (*ubudiyyah*) is the last stage of the Sufi *sulūk*. To be one with God is certainly not the object of Sufism. The Qur'a'an and the Sunnah do not command it, and the vision of God's transcendence which Revelation upholds rules it out. The experience of union which may suggest that it is the goal, is a transitional experience; the Sufi must go beyond it, and affirm the unbridgeable difference that lies between the servant and the Lord.

The experience of unity is not an appropriation of reality. It does not mean that the mystic really becomes one with God. He has nothing more than a perception that he is one with God: his experience is merely a matter of vision. No one unites with God, nor does God unite with anyone. The Sufi realises this truth when he advances beyond the unitive experience, and reaches the end of the journey; at that time he perceives that God transcends the world absolutely. Sufis who have regarded the experience of union with God or realisation of unity as the goal of Sufism, are the ones who are detained at the unitive stage of their experience. They lose their sense of discrimination, become intoxicated, utter words like 'I am God' or 'Glory to me', and make high claims (*shāh*). However, when they come out of their intoxication, and advance to higher stages, they regret their

boastful and deificatory statements. Intoxication and *shayṭān* are signs of the immaturity of the Sufi, rather than his perfection.

The ideal of service to God which is the goal of Sufism involves the entire personality of man: his intellect, his will, his feelings and sentiments. It means to believe in God's Revelation, and have faith and conviction; it means to resign oneself to His decree and submit to His will, accept His *Shari'ah* and obey His commands. It means to worship, pray and remember; to feel lowly before God's majesty, fear His wrath, seek His pleasure, bear patiently His trials, and persevere in obedience. It means to fulfil the duties, avoid sin, refrain from what is low and trifling, and seek what is commendable and noble. It means to feel for humanity and work for their well-being, to preach the word of God and show the right path, to struggle for what is true and just and fight what is false and evil. It means to work for the *Shari'ah* of God, and try to establish His Kingdom on earth as it is in Heaven.

Different elements of this ideal of complete service are not, to be sure, of the same level. Some are higher and some are lower. Moreover, differences of individual lives, and changes in social situations affect normal priorities. But it is important that values and priorities should be decided strictly on the grounds of the *Shari'ah*. The experience of the Sufi, or his *kashf*, at theory of religious realities (*haqā'iq dīniyah*) developed on mystical grounds, the demands of the Sufi *tariqah*, or personal likes and dislikes, have no role to play in determining priorities. Nor can *kashf* and vision affect the grounds for the commands of the *Shari'ah*. They cannot, for instance, make up the weakness of a hadith or reduce the strength of the other whose weakness or strength is known on grounds recognised in the discipline of hadith. *Kashf* has absolutely no say in the legality of acts, or the degree of their obligation and value.

The same is true for philosophical reason. Questions of man's ultimate end and values are not to be decided on the basis of a philosophical theory (such as the one al-Ghazali has developed) unless it is corroborated by the *Shari'ah*.

What is true regarding fundamental questions of reality is also true regarding the issues of ultimate values.

Sufism is not an attempt to lead a kind of life different from the life of the Prophet. For a Sufi, as for an ordinary Muslim, the ideal is the Prophet's life. That is the standard of excellence and perfection. The life which diverges from that pattern has no claim for excellence; on the contrary, it is liable to be censured if the divergence crosses proper limits, and the person stands condemned if the divergence is deliberate. The ecstatic absorption in God, forgetting oneself and the world around, which Sufis experience at a particular stage of *suluk*, is not at all an ideal. It is to be appreciated only as a step towards final sobriety and intelligent service to God. Persistence in that state is not to be applauded. The Sufi should regain self-consciousness, return to the world, and serve God honestly and selflessly, which is what his experience of *fana'* and *baqā'* are meant for. He should engage himself in preaching and instruction, in purifying life and promoting piety, and serving the religion of God as the Prophet did. The Sufi who follows God's religion internally and externally, without any qualifications, and in complete sincerity, follows the Prophet most truly and is his real inheritor (*wārit*).

The greatness of the Sufi depends upon his faith and conviction; his *dhikr* and worship; his fear and love, patience and trust, sincerity and honesty; and his observance of the *Shari'ah*, service to Islam, *jihād* and sacrifice. Miracles and wonders are neither the requirements of *walāyat*, nor the measure of his nearness to God. They add to his greatness only when he uses them in the service of Islam. Similarly, the ideas and truths that he advances on the basis of his *kashf* may add to his honour when they agree with Revelation, and promote its objectives.

No wali is independent of the Prophet, nor equal to him. His experience is subject to the Revelation of the Prophet; his *kashf* and his vision, his ideas and revelations are to be validated with reference to the Prophetic truths; he has to obey the rules of his *Shari'ah*, observe the values and priorities of his religion and follow the example of his life. Whichever honour or favour he receives from God is through

His Prophet and by following him. Sufis who have claimed to be greater than the Prophet, have made that claim in a state of intoxication; their words are to be ignored, rather than quoted.

The idea that the *walāyat* of a prophet is better than his prophecy (*nubūwat*) is also incorrect. It is the result of a wrong comparison between the life of a prophet and the life of a wali. The wali first occupies himself with God, passes through *fānā'* and union, then experiences separation and *baqā'*, returns to the world and attends to people. His 'ascent' to God and his 'descent' to men are two phases of his life. The prophet neither experiences *fānā'* nor *baqā'*, neither ascent nor descent. His contact with God, reception of revelation, and his devotion to God which Sufis love to call his *walāyat*, and his 'contact with people, preaching and performing the duties of prophecy (*nubūwat*), are not two phases of his career, one coming after the other. They are two moments of his life, intertwined with each other. The prophet does not lose sight of the people when he is most near to God, nor does he turn away from God when he is most occupied with people. He comes nearer to God as he performs his duties of prophecy; his action as prophet is also his devotion to God.

*Tasawwuf* is essentially a *tariqah* to purify oneself, to attain strong conviction in the truths of the Prophet's Revelation, to obey the commands of the Shari'ah most honestly, and to make obedience absolutely selfless, for nothing but the pleasure of God. It is a way to be the most honest and sincere servant of God. It is neither a pursuit of mystery nor an exercise in deification.

The *tariqah* of the Sufi is in a sense one with the *tariqah* of the Prophet, and in a sense different. It has a part in common with the Prophetic *tariqah*, such as the basic forms of worship ('ibādāt): *salāt*, fasting, reading the Qur'an, prayer (*du'a*) and various forms of *dhikr*, some of which are obligatory (*fard*) and some recommended (*sunnah*). Another part of the Sufi *tariqah* is derived in principle from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, but developed and elaborated on different lines; various forms of *dhikr* and contemplation (*fikr*) which are practised by the Sufis fall into this category. A third part

is completely new, such as the experience of *fānā'* and *baqā'*, union and separation, and the methods and practices which promote these experiences. On the other hand, a part of the Prophetic *tariqah* such as preaching the word of God, promoting the rule of the Shari'ah and *jihād* which are an essential part of the Prophet's way for the purification of man, have been usually ignored or played down in Sufism. There are, however, notable exceptions to this general rule. The main prop of the Sufi *tariqah* is *dhikr* and contemplation (*fikr*); and its most distinctive part is the experience of *fānā'* and *baqā'*.

It is important to be clear as to how the Sufi *tariqah* is one with the Prophetic *tariqah* and how it is different. This will help the Sufi keep his practices and ways that are different within proper limits; it will also urge him to engage in activities which are not usually part of the Sufi *tariqah* and follow the Sunnah of the Prophet more completely. Sirhindī notes that the belief in *wahdat 'l-wujūd* is not necessary for the attainment of *fānā'* and *baqā'*. The perception of One Being (*tawhīd shuhūdī*) is enough. The Sufi is likely to develop a belief in One Being in the course of his *suluk* but he can also avoid it. Nor is it unusual that he identifies the visions and voices, lights and appearances which he encounters, with God. But he should remember that they are part of creation, and therefore try to rise above them, and realise that God transcends all appearances and visions.

This view of Sufism is not the view of Shaykh Ahmad alone. Leading Sufis in every age who have inspired and elevated the lives of thousands of Muslims have in general subscribed to these ideas. Those who have said or done things that are inconsistent with this view have done so at the stage of *fānā'* and union and under the intoxicative effect of that experience, or because they have not freed themselves completely of its influence, if they have advanced further. The Sufis who have reached the end of the road and attained perfection would completely agree with this view. If one finds still some discordant notes in their thought and life, it may be because they could not be aware of their discordance. In the course of this book I have tried to substantiate this

view from the history of Sufism. Though more work will have to be done before one can claim to have established it, I hope that what has been done here is enough to make it plausible, and recommend it for serious consideration. Sufism as defined by Sirhindī has its rightful place in Islam, and can without reservation be called Islamic Sufism. This claim can be backed by comparing the ideas of Sirhindī with those of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah (d. 728/1328) who has examined, more than anybody else, Sufi ideas and practices in the light of the Qur'ān and Sunnah as interpreted by the elders (*aslāf*) of Islam. I will state his ideas on Sufism at some length, so that the reader may ascertain the truth of the claim for himself.

### Ibn Taymiyah and Sufism

The popular image of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah, which early Western writers on Islam in modern times have considerably helped to build up, is that he criticises Sufism indiscriminately, is totally against the Sufis, and sees no place for Sufism in Islam.<sup>8</sup> Nothing of this, however, is correct. Ibn Taymiyah, to be sure, is a most thorough and most incisive critic of Sufism; and his criticism is not limited to a few philosophical doctrines or some popular practices, as some writers<sup>9</sup> have held, but covers the entire field of Sufi thought and life. But he is certainly not indiscriminate; at times, he is bitter, but on the whole sympathetic. And far from saying that Sufism has no place in Islam, he moves to define the perimeters of an Islamic Sufism.<sup>10</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah's general attitude to Sufism is disclosed in this passage: 'Some people accept everything of Sufism, what is right as well as what is wrong; others reject it totally, both what is wrong and what is right, as some scholars of *kalām* and *fīqh* do.' The right attitude towards Sufism, or any other thing, is to accept what is in agreement with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, and reject what does not agree.'<sup>11</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah applies this principle of judicious criticism to Sufi ideas, practices and personalities. He divides the Sufis into three categories. In the first category of Sufis whom he

calls *mashā'ikh* 'I-Islām, *mashū'ikh* 'I-Kutub wa 'I-Sunnah and *a'immat* 'I-hudā,<sup>12</sup> he mentions Fudayl b. 'Iyād (d. 187/803), Ibrāhīm b. Adham (d. 160/777), Shaqiq 'I-Balkhī (d. 194/810), Abū Sulaymān 'I-Dārānī (d. 215/831), Ma'rūf 'I-Karkhī (d. 200/815), Bishr 'I-Hāfi (d. 227/841), Sari 'I-Saqatī (d. 257/871), al-Junayd b. Muḥammad (d. 297/909), Saḥl b. 'Abd Allāh 'I-Tusṭarī (d. 283/897) and 'Amr b. 'Uthmān 'I-Makki (d. 291/904). Later Sufis whom he places in this category are: 'Abd 'I-Qādir 'I-Jilānī (d. 561/1166), Shaykh Ḥamnād 'I-Dabbās (d. 525/1130), and Shaykh Abū 'I-Bayān (d. 551/1156). These Sufis, Ibn Taymiyah says, were never intoxicated, did not lose their sense of discrimination, or said or did anything against the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. Their lives and experiences conformed with the Shari'ah (*mustaqim* 'I-dhawā').<sup>13</sup>

The second category consists of those Sufis whose 'experience of *fānā*' and intoxication (*sukr*) weakened their sense of discrimination, and made them utter words that they later realised to be erroneous when they became sober'.<sup>14</sup> Some of them also did things<sup>15</sup> under intoxication of which the Shari'ah does not approve, but sooner or later they became sober and lived well. In this category Ibn Taymiyah mentions the names of Abū Yazid 'I-Bistāmī (d. 261/875), Abū 'I-Husayn 'I-Nūrī (d. 295/907) and Abū Bakr 'I-Shiblī (d. 334/946). But he neither censures their experience of *fānā* and *sukr*, nor condemns what they said or did in that state. Instead, he offers apology for them on the ground that they were intoxicated (*sukrān*), and had lost control over reason.<sup>16</sup> His criticism is directed to the third category of Sufis who have believed in ideas and expounded doctrines which contradict Islamic principles, or who have indulged in practices which are condemned by the Shari'ah. The first Sufi in this group is al-Ḥallāj (d. 309/922). Ibn Taymiyah says that al-Ḥallāj believed in the doctrine of particular incarnation (*ḥulūl khāṣṣ*) on the pattern of the Christian belief regarding Jesus. He also charges him with indulging in practices such as magic and sorcery.<sup>17</sup>

Next to al-Ḥallāj, the Sufis who draw strong criticism from Ibn Taymiyah are the ones who expound the doctrine of One Being (*wahdat* 'I-wujūd), such as Ibn 'I-'Arabī (d.

638/1240), Sadr 'I-Din 'I-Qunāwī (d. 672/1273), Ibn Sab'in (d. 668/1269) and Tilimsānī (d. 690/1291). Ibn Taymiyah discusses the basic concepts of *wahdat* '*l-wujūd*' which they hold in common, mentions the points on which they differ, examines them on rational grounds and points out their incompatibility with Islamic principles.

Ibn 'I-'Arabī, who is the central figure in this context, Ibn Taymiyah subjects to detailed criticism. He is, however, fair to recognise that 'of all the exponents of *wahdat* '*l-wujūd*' he is closer to Islam, that many of his ideas are correct, that he distinguishes between the Manifest (*al-Zāhir*) and the objects of manifestation (*mazāhir*), and accepts the commands and the prohibitions (of the *Shar'*) and other principles as they are. He recommends many things in *suluk* which Sufi leaders have prescribed concerning good behaviour and devotion. This is why a number of people draw upon his writings in their *suluk* and benefit from them, even though they do not know their real import.<sup>19</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah criticises Ibn 'I-'Arabī for believing that *wujūd* (being/existence) is one, that the *wujūd* of the world is the same as the *wujūd* of God, and that the objects are God's determinations. He thinks that Ibn 'I-'Arabī cannot explain the difference between God and the world with reference to the essences of things which have no footing in existence. Though he does not say that their difference is subjective, as Tilimsānī<sup>20</sup> does, a lot of things, Ibn Taymiyah points out, follow from the basic principles of his *wahdat* '*l-wujūd*' which are reprehensible and contradict the essentials of Islam.

For instance, the doctrine identifies the existence of everything, however sordid and filthy, with the existence of God, and ascribes all the attributes of things, good and bad, to Him. It is God who is beautiful and ugly; perfect and imperfect, righteous and wicked; it is He who believes in everything, true and false, faith and infidelity; it is He who commits right and wrong, feels pleasure and pain, is rewarded or punished, and is happy or miserable. This is not an inference, Ibn Taymiyah says, from Ibn 'I-'Arabī's doctrine, but what he has himself stated.<sup>21</sup>

Ibn 'I-'Arabī's doctrine contradicts the basic principles of

Islam: it justifies polytheism and idolatry, denies any real difference between *tawhīd* and *shirk*, and dubs the prophets' call to worship one God as their trick (*maqr*).<sup>22</sup> He subscribes to the baseless idea of 'the Seal of the Saints' (*khatim* '*l-awliyā'*), claims that position for himself, asserts that his *wahdat* '*l-wujūd*' is the absolute truth, and all other beliefs are partially true, and that the prophets including the Seal of the Prophets (*khatim* '*l-Nabi*'<sup>23</sup>) get truth from him,<sup>24</sup> although he receives the *Shar'* from the Prophet and is subject to his authority. He invokes the pre-ordination (*qadr*) of God to condone wrong beliefs and evil practices, and explains away punishment in the Hereafter.<sup>24</sup> Ibn Taymiyah denounces these ideas as *kufr* and *zandaqah*,<sup>25</sup> but he does not find fault with Ibn 'I-'Arabī's life and behaviour. Of the expounders of *wahdat* '*l-wujūd*', there is only one, Tilimsānī, whom he calls wicked (*fājir*)<sup>26</sup> for his antinomian attitudes. Ibn Taymiyah has nothing against the Sufi experience of *fanā'* and *baqā'* as such. He notes that it happens to the travellers of the Sufi path. They become so immersed in God that they forget themselves and the world, and feel that they have lost themselves and become one with God. This is the state of self-effacement (*isti'lām*) and union (*jam'*).<sup>27</sup> Many Sufis in this state lose their sense of discrimination and pronounce: 'I am God' and 'Glory to me!' Some make loud claims: 'I would put my tents at the Jahannam' (to save men); others commit objectionable acts. Ibn Taymiyah says that such words and behaviour are not to be censured, and the Sufi should be excused on the ground that he is not in his proper senses.<sup>28</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah calls this experience *fanā'* *shuhūdī*, because it is a matter of perception (*shuhūda*) only. The Sufi sees that he has lost himself and become one with God. It does not mean that he is really one with God or that he *believes* that he is one with Him. The experience may, however, lead and has led Sufis to believe that they are one with God. The belief may take different forms: One is that God has entered into the Sufi as al-Hallāj believed, or that He has entered into the world. The other is that God and the world are really One Being, and there is no difference between the servant and the Lord.<sup>29</sup> This is the *fanā'* *wujūdī* of the people

who believe in *wahdat 'l-wujūd*. They develop this belief, Ibn Taymiyah says, 'due to the weakness of their heart which fails to see things as they are, and does not perceive the difference in union or multiplicity in unity'.<sup>30</sup> Neither of these two *fānā's* was known to the Prophet or his Companions. Ibn Taymiyah observes: 'The Companions had a perfect faith and a strong conviction. They did not lose their reason, nor went into a swoon; they never felt intoxication, experienced effacement, or became mad with love. These things first appeared at the time of the *tūbī* in (the following generation) among the devotees ('ubbād) of Basra.'<sup>31</sup> He further observes that 'the *fānā*' which we get in the books of sober Sufis like Shaykh 'l-Islām, 'Abdullāh 'l-Ansārī (d. 481/1088) and the Sufis before him is the *fānā shuhūdī*, even though some of them have entertained wrong ideas about it'.<sup>32</sup>

Some Sufis are, for instance, so intensely conscious of God's absolute power and His complete control over the world, or His pre-ordination of things and events (*qadr*) that they hold back from calling things good and bad as the Sharī'ah does. They are so overwhelmed by God's *qadr* that they do not see a place for His *amr* (law), or are so immersed in the vision of His lordship (*rububiyyah*) that they do not move to fulfil the demands of His divinity (*ulūhiyyah*).<sup>33</sup> Some do not see any room for supplication (*du'ā*),<sup>34</sup> or any justification for preaching and *jihād*. They believe that their task is to resign themselves to every decree of God, and accept everything good or bad. They refuse to make any effort to correct what is wrong, or fight what is evil.<sup>35</sup> Ibn Taymiyah discusses these mistaken ideas at length, exposes their fallacy in the light of the Qur'ān and Sunnah, and offers a rational view of pre-ordination (*qadr*) and Divine rule. He praises Sufis like 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī who did not fall into these errors, who believed in *qadr* but also adhered to the *Shar'*, who were intensely conscious of God's rule, yet worked against that which was false and evil.<sup>36</sup> One of the main objects of his Commentary<sup>37</sup> on a part of Shaykh al-Jilānī's *Futūh 'l-Ghayb* is to show how he has steered clear of the dilemma into which others have got themselves.

Some Sufis consider that *fānā' shuhūdī* is the goal of

Sufism. Even Shaykh 'Abdullāh 'l-Ansārī, the author of *Manāzil 'l-Sā'irin*, notwithstanding his greatness, held the same view.<sup>38</sup> This is, however, the goal of imperfect Sufis (*qāfirin*).<sup>39</sup> The Sufi has to go, Ibn Taymiyah says, beyond *fānā' shuhūdī*, and disentangle himself the second time (*fārq thānī*),<sup>40</sup> reaffirm his servanthood, and carry out the will of God in such a way as if he has no will of his own. The goal of the perfect Sufi is the effacement of will, *fānā' irādī*, which he defines as a state in which 'one loses every interest in what God does not command, engages in what He orders, turns away from every other worship and worships God alone, gives up every other obedience and obeys Him only, depends on nobody except Him, loves only Him and His Prophet, fears Him alone,<sup>41</sup> seeks nobody's help but His, and tries to please no one but Him'.<sup>42</sup> This is the *fānā'* which the Qur'ān and the Sunnah teach. Ibn Taymiyah calls it *fānā' dīni* and *fānā' shar'i*, and says that this is the state of the prophets and their companions, and the state of the rightly guided Sufis.<sup>43</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah does not deny extra-revelatory ways of Divine guidance or *kashf*. Referring to the Qur'ānic verse (42: 51), he says God talks to man in three ways: from behind a veil, through an angelic messenger, or through secret communication (*iḥā*). The wali shares the last one;<sup>44</sup> the first two are for the prophet alone. But the Sufi *kashf* is not infallible and certain. Certitude belongs only to the prophetic *wahy*. Ibn Taymiyah quotes a number of Sufis on this point. Abū 'l-Hasan 'l-Shādhili (d. 656/1258), for instance, said: 'We have been assured of the truth of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah; but the truth which is revealed in *kashf* and inspiration (*iḥām*) is not guaranteed'.<sup>45</sup> Ibn Taymiyah doubts the efficacy of the gnostic way in knowing reality through purification of the heart of which al-Ghazālī talks a lot. He remarks: 'A Christian monk, when he polishes his soul, sees in it the image of Trinity, and is addressed through it. Since he had the image of Trinity before, his soul when polished by devotions, sees the image in vision. On the other hand, a Muslim who loves God and the Prophet sees the Prophet in a dream as he imagines Him'.<sup>46</sup> But

he does not reject the gnostic method altogether. ‘A section of people of *kalām* and reason’, he says, ‘reject many of the things that (al-Ghazzālī) has said, and think that devotion and purification of the heart does not contribute to knowledge. They are certainly wrong. The truth is that piety and purification of the heart are some of the great means of acquiring knowledge.’<sup>47</sup> He, however, denies that it is a way by itself, a self-authenticating means of knowledge, reliable and certain. ‘One has to abide’, he says, ‘by the Qur’ān and Sunnah, in knowledge and action; no one can possibly know what the prophet has said of transcendental realities directly by himself, independent of the agency of prophecy. And no one can dispense with what the prophet has communicated concerning matters of reality. The word of the prophet is self-authenticating, and the *kashf* or the opinion of anyone cannot rule on it.’<sup>48</sup>

In matters of worship and rituals (*qurb*), *kashf* has no role at all: ‘The forms of *qurb* and worship (*ibādat*) are known only through the prophets, and there is nothing *haram* except what God has forbidden, and there is nothing *dīn* except what He has prescribed.’<sup>49</sup> *Kashf* may, however, have a say in cases where arguments from the principal sources of the Shari‘ah collide, and one is at a loss to decide as to what is the proper course. In such cases *kashf* or inspiration (*ihām*) is a stronger reason than an unsound (*da‘īf*) hadith or a weak analogy (*qiyās*). Ibn Taymiyah writes: ‘Those who say that *ihām* does not count at all are wrong; and those who think that it is an approved way (*shar‘*) of knowing are also wrong. When the *sālik* after taking all the clear arguments of the Shari‘ah into consideration fails to come to a judgement, his inspiration may be an argument for him, provided he is pious and has right motives. At times *kashf* is a stronger argument than a far-fetched analogy, unsound hadith, weak opinion, and *istishāb* on which the followers of a *fīqh* school so much rely.’<sup>50</sup>

The greatness of a wali lies not in *fana’ wujūdī* or *shuhūdī*; it lies in serving God. ‘Man is the servant of God, and in the service of God lies his perfection and glory. The more one serves God, the more perfect one is. If he thinks that he can transcend the boundaries of servanthood, or that it

is a mark of perfection, he is most ignorant, and farthest removed from the right path.’<sup>51</sup>

The measure of a wali’s greatness is his faith and his obedience to God. Miracles are no criterion. ‘The revelation of secrets (*kashf*) or the control over events (*taṣarruf*), are not necessarily better than those acts which do not produce them. If a *kashf* and *taṣarruf* is not helpful for religion it is a worldly thing: a lot of infidels, pagans and men of the Book, (*ahl ’l-Kitāb*) perform them, whereas many Muslims don’t.’<sup>52</sup> ‘The best of the walīs of God are those who follow the Prophet most closely: that is why Abū Bakr is the greatest wali after the prophets.’<sup>53</sup>

Ibn Taymiyah does not oppose the *tarīqah* of the Sufis as such, neither their concentration on some approved ways, nor adoption of new ones, provided they do not fall into the category of unauthorised innovation (*bid’at*). He does not object, for instance, to the experience of *fana’* and union; what he requires is that one should not make it the goal of Sufism, or entertain mistaken ideas about it. He would not object to intensification of some approved forms of *dhikr*, or reliance on some methods for purifying the soul, with the neglect of others, provided it is within the limits of the Shari‘ah.<sup>54</sup> A Sufi may, for instance, withdraw temporarily to a cloister (*khawlah*),<sup>55</sup> provided he observes the *salāt* in assembly and the Friday prayer, and renders his essential obligations. Ibn Taymiyah would insist that these practices should not change or alter the values of things which the Shari‘ah normally attaches to them.<sup>56</sup> ‘There is no way to God’, he says, ‘except following the Prophet externally and internally.’<sup>57</sup>

The way to know what the inner realities (*haqāiq*) of religion such as renunciation (*zuhd*), abstinence (*wara’*), love (*mahabbah*), trust (*tawakkul*), resignation (*ridā*), sincerity (*ikhlas*), thankfulness (*shukr*) and patience (*sabr*) are, is the Qur’ān, the Sunnah of the Prophet, and the lives of the Companions. The more one moves away from this period, the more is the meaning of these realities influenced by external factors, such as philosophical ideas, Sufi practices and experiences, doubtful traditions and ascetic tendencies.<sup>58</sup> I have stated Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah’s views on Sufism as

faithfully as I could. I hope that this presentation will remove many wrong notions that people have regarding his attitude towards Sufism. Ibn Taymiyah does not oppose Sufism as such, nor is he a sworn enemy of the Sufis. He does condemn Sufis like al-Hallāj, Ibn 1-'Arabī and 'Uthmānī, but he also applauds others like Fudayl, Junayd and 'Abd 1-Qādir. He does not object to the Sufi experience of *fana'* and union (*jam'*), but he does object to making absorption in that experience (*fana'* *shuhūdī*) the goal of Sufism, or talk, on that basis, of *ḥulūl* or expounding *wahdat 1-wujūd*. He is not against the Sufi *tariqah* as such, their concentration on *dhikr* and *fikr*, or their *sayr* and *sulūk*. He is critical only of some ways of *dhikr*, such as the *dhikr* merely of the word Allāh or *Huwa* (He);<sup>59</sup> because the *dhikrs* which the Qur'ān and the Sunnah have taught us are meaningful sentences, not simply a name or a pronoun. This, in his view, is a *bid'at* and should be avoided. He is not even opposed to the idea of *waliyat* or wali in the particular sense in which Sufis use the terms. He would, however, oppose with all force, and very rightly, the idea that the wali can dispense with the Shari'ah or claim any kind of independence from the prophet. Ibn Taymiyah does not reject *kashf* either: but he does not consider it to be an independent source for the knowledge of reality or value.

On reading through these pages it will be apparent how identical are the views of Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah and Shaykh Sirhindi on major issues: the goal of Sufism; the nature of mystic experience and its various levels; the relation of *kashf* with the *wāhi* of the prophet; how the wali stands with the *nabi*, or the *tariqah* with the Shari'ah, and what is the idea of true religious life (*haqiqah*). Also discernible will be the identity of their views on prophecy, the mission of the prophet, and service ('ibādah) to God, which is the purpose of man's life on earth.

Does this mean that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah had an influence on Shaykh Sirhindi's thought? This is a difficult question to answer. Shaykh Ahmad readily recognised his indebtedness to his predecessors, whether they were Sufis, theologians or logicians. But he never mentions Ibn Taymiyah; most probably he was not aware of him. If this is true then the

identity of their views can only be explained in terms of their common attitude to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet: of upholding quite seriously their supremacy over all human ways of knowing things, reason or *kashf*.

I do not want to give the impression that Shaykh Ahmad and Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah have no different opinions. They do; but if we leave out the questions of theology, with which we are not concerned here, and confine our attention to matters of Sufism, their difference is related to, I would say, small matters of detail rather than principles. For instance, Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah violently denounces al-Hallāj and Ibn 1-'Arabī, whereas Shaykh Sirhindi condemns their views but abstains from denouncing them. Also, Ibn Taymiyah may have reservations about some practices in the Naqshbandi *sulūk* which are approved by Sirhindi. But these things are not of much significance.

I close this chapter by saying that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyah's ideas are a real testimony to the Islamic character of the Sufism which Shaykh Sirhindi expounded. I hope that it will not be difficult now for anyone to see that Sufism, properly conceived, has a rightful place in Islam.

#### Notes and References (Chapter One)

1. Mulla Kanāl had among his students the last great theologian of Islam, 'Abd 'l-Hakīm Siālkotī (d. 1067/1656), the writer of a super-Commentary on the *Shāfi'i* 'Maqāṣid of Jurjānī, besides other independent treatises on theological subjects, and the *Shaykh* 'l-Islām during the reign of Shāhjahān. Siālkotī had a great appreciation for Sirhindī's work, regarded him as the Renovator of the Second Millennium (*Mujaddid Af Thani*) and commented on his achievements in his *Dalīl* 'l-Taqdīd.
2. Nūr 'l-Ḥasan: Abū 'l-Fadl, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., Vol. I, p. 117; Rizwī, S. A. A.: *Religious and Intellectual History of the Muslims in Akbar's Reign*, New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1975, Ch. IX: Religious and Political Thought of Abū 'l-Fadl, pp. 339–73.
3. See *infra*, p. 18.
4. Sirhindī, *Iḥbāt* 'l-Nubūwah, Arabic text with Urdu trans., Ghulām Muṣṭafā Khān, Karachi, 1383 A.H., p. 6.
5. Muhammad Hāshim Kishāmi, *Zubdat* 'l-Maqāmāt, Lucknow, Nawāli-kishore, 1890, p. 132. Sirhindī seems to refer to this discussion in the *Iḥbāt* 'l-Nubūwah, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
6. Nadwi, S. Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī, *Tārikh Da'wat wa 'Āzimat*, Vol. IV, (which deals with the life and work of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī), Lucknow, 1980, p. 140.
7. Muhammad Hāshim, *Zubdat* 'l-Maqāmāt, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
8. *Khīraqah* is the gown which the Sufi teacher gives to a disciple either at the time of his initiation or at the completion of his *sūlik* when he permits him to teach the *ṭarīqah*. It is the latter which is meant here.
9. Sirhindī, Shaykh Ahmad, *Maktabāt*, ed. Nūr Ahmad, Lahore, Nur Company, 1384/1964, Vol. II:44, pp. 989–90. All references to the *Maktabāt* are of this edition, unless otherwise mentioned.
10. Sirhindī, *Risālah Taqlīyah*, Arabic text with Urdu trans., Ghulām Muṣṭafā Khān, Karachi, Idārah Mujaddidiyah, 1965, p. 28; Muhammad Hāshim Kishāmi, *Zubdat* 'l-Maqāmāt, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
11. Muhammad Hāshim Kishāmi: *Zubdat* 'l-Maqāmāt, *op. cit.*, p. 117; Nadwi, S. A. Ḥasan, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
12. *Nisbat fardiyah* refers, as Sirhindī explains here, to the inner state of the Sufi when he reaches the final point of his mystical ascent ('urūj).
13. Sirhindī, *Mabda wa Ma'ād*, Delhi, Muṭba' Ansārī, n.d., p. 4.
14. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:290, p. 741; I:266, p. 584. For *Naqshbandī Nisbat* see *infra*, Ch. 2, note 49.
15. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:290, p. 744.
16. Nadwi, S. A. 'Alī, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 150–1; Muhammad Ḥasan, *Maqāmāt Inām Rabbāni, Mujaddid Alf Thāni*, Lucknow, Shahī Press, 1333 A.H., p. 9.
17. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:290, p. 744. It has been reported that the Khwājah deputed Sirhindī at Lahore to preach the *ṭarīqah*. See

Nadwi, S. A. 'Alī, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, p. 153.  
 18. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:266, p. 585; Nadwi, S. A. 'Alī, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, p. 150.  
 19. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:31, p. 102.  
 20. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:160, pp. 338–9.  
 21. Sirhindī's claim that before reaching the final truth he passed through the unitive stage and in *wahdat* 'l-wujūd, has been questioned by Dr. Yohanān Friedmann. He doubts that Sirhindī ever experienced union, passed through the state of intoxication, spoke of One Being and uttered ecstatic words (*shāthī*) (*Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī: An Outline of His Thought and A Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*, Montreal, McGill/Queen's University Press, 1971, pp. 6, 20, 24). He avoids clearly mentioning what he means. But the implication is quite clear, namely, that Sirhindī is not a genuine Sufi, because he did not obtain union or experience ecstasy and intoxication, which to many modern writers on Sufism, and he is no exception, are the marks of true Sufism. Professor Muhammad Muṣṭib is more candid when he remarks: 'Sheikh Ahmad did not possess the temperament or the outlook characteristic of the mystical type . . . (*The Indian Muslims*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1967, p. 245).

The sole ground on which Friedmann bases his case is this: Sirhindī says that when he was passing through the stage of *tawhīd wujūd* he was so much enamoured by it that he expressed ideas of that *tawhīd* in his writings. But since such ideas are not found in his extant works, the claim that he passed through the stage of *tawhīd wujūd* is fake.

First of all, a cursory reading of the letter I:290 translated in this work (pp. 202–6) wherein Sirhindī describes the various stages of his mystical experience at length including that of union and oneness will be sufficient to convince that its writer is describing a real rather than a fake experience. Second, as for the writings of the period of *tawhīd wujūd*, Sirhindī says that 'they were scattered by friends and that it was no more possible to collect them, hence I have left them as such'. (*Maktabāt*, Vol. I:291, p. 758.) There is no reason why Sirhindī should have made it a point to preserve them, when he no longer held those ideas. Third, some of these writings were found later by his disciples and were put in a volume called *Ma'ārif Ladūniyyah*. The learned editor of this book writes in the Preface: 'In the course of my comparison and collation it became clear to me that these ideas (*ma'ārif*) came to him (i.e. Sirhindī) in the early period of his *sulūk* in the Naqshbandī *ṭarīqah*. In these *ma'ārif* he identifies the Divine Essence with existence (*wujūd*), and the essences of contingent beings with the essential modes of God differentiated in Divine knowledge, and regards them as necessary. Similarly, he considers that perfection lies in the combination of immanence with transcendence, and affirms the status of mirrorhood. These four principles are the basic concepts of the system of Shaykh Akbar (*Ma'ārif Ladūniyyah*, ed. 'Abd 'l-Majid Salāfi, Lahore, 1376

A.H., p. 2). The more relevant sections (*ma'ārif*) are 5, 8, and 10. Fourth, the first passage that we have quoted in the text (p. 14) contains a quatrain which Sirhindī says he wrote to his preceptor, Khwājah 'Abd 'l-Bāqī, when he was passing through the stage of *tawḥīd wujūdī*. This is supported by the letter which the Khwājah wrote in reply wherein he reprimanded Sirhindī on his quatrain: 'And the quatrain which you have written is foolish and nonsensical. Its writer will never be acceptable to God. You should be humble before God; He is Sublime and Self-Respecting.' (Ikram, Sh., *Rawḍ Kavīthar*, Karachi, 'Taj Office, n.d., p. 153.)

By making these observations, however, I should not be taken to mean, as our writers do, that a true Sufi at some stage of his *sufiik* must believe in *tawḥīd wujūdī* or speak *shāthī*. The experience of union is essential to the Sufi *tarīqah*; but belief in *wahdat l-wujūd* or uttering *shāthī* are no part of Sufism.

22. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:13, I:31, I:36, I:36; I:60; I:291.
23. For details see Nadwi, S. A. A., *Tārīkh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 154–6.
24. Jahāngīr, *Tuzuk-i-Jahangīr*, ed. Sayed Ahmad Khan, Aligarh, 128/1864, pp. 272–3.
25. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:131, pp. 304–5; I:168, p. 352; I:221, pp. 464–5; I:313, pp. 827–8.
26. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:6, p. 872.
27. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:234, p. 495; I:261, p. 574; II:4, p. 870; III:100, p. 1506.
28. See Bibliography.
29. Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 175. On Mullā Mu'barrak Nāgāwī see Sir Woseley Haig, (planned), Sir Richard Burn, (ed.), *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. IV, Cambridge, 1937, pp. 114, 106.
30. Badāyīnī, 'Abd 'l-Qādir, *Munakhab l-Tawārīkh*, Calcutta, 1865, Vol. 3, pp. 130–1. On Fath Allāh Shirāzī see M. Aslam, *Sarmāyah 'Umar*, Nadwat l-Musannifin, Lahore, 1976, pp. 9–30.
31. Badāyīnī, *Munakhab l-Tawārīkh*, Vol. II, pp. 245–8.
32. Sirhindī, *Ithbāt l-Nubūwah*, pp. 19, 20.
33. See *infra*, p. 72 and pp. 208–10.
34. M. Aslam, *Sarmāyah 'Umar*, op. cit., p. 114.
35. Nadwi, S. A. 'Ali, *Tārīkh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, p. 45.
36. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:120, P. 278; I:251, pp. 523–8; I:266, pp. 616–20; II:15, p. 893; II:36, pp. 931–58; II:67, pp. 1077–8; II:96, pp. 1139–50.
37. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:251, p. 523; II:96, p. 1150.
38. Sirhindī mentions that 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492) and others find fault with Amir Mu'āwiyyah (*Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:251, pp. 524–5).
39. In his treatise, *Radd-i-Rawāfiq*, Sirhindī mentions a number of Shi'ah sects and their beliefs. Some of these beliefs contradict the established beliefs of Islam, such as 'Ali is a god; or that the revelation was in fact sent to 'Ali, but Gabriel made a mistake and gave it to Muhammad; or that human souls are born again and again in different bodies. Major Shi'ah sects do not hold these beliefs; only some very insignificant extremist sects do, and have been condemned

as infidels by the Ummah. Opinions have, however, differed about those Shi'ahs who abuse the Companions of the Prophet, particularly the first three righteous caliphs, and those who fought with 'Ali later. Sunni scholars condemn these acts very strongly, but excepting a few later Hanafi scholars, particularly the 'ulamā of Central Asia, the majority do not charge them with infidelity. However, most of them would not refrain from dubbing those Shi'ahs as infidels (*kafir*) who say and believe that Abū Bakr, 'Umar or the Community of Companions were infidels. In the *Radd*, Sirhindī defends the stand of the 'ulamā of Māwarā 'l-Nahr that those Shi'ahs who charge the Companions with infidelity or abuse them strongly are infidels. In his letters, however, he condemns these acts as *fisq* and *bi'dat* and refrains from calling their perpetrators infidels. [For a fuller discussion of the subject see Ibn 'Abidīn's treatise, *Tanbīh l-Wulā wa l-Hukkām 'alā akhām Shātin Khair l-Anām aw Ahd Ashabī l-Kirām* in the collection of his treatises, *Rās' il-Bīn 'Abidīn*, place and date of publication not mentioned, Vol. I, pp. 357–71. Shaykh 'l-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in his book, *Al-Sārīm l-Maslūl 'alā Shātim l-Rasūl*, Al-Subki in *Al-Sayf l-Maslūl 'alā 'Man Sabba l-Rasūl*, Qādi 'Iyād in *Al-Saqīf* and many others have discussed the issue.]

40. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:266, p. 299.
41. Kurub Khānāh Al-Furqān, 1982, p. 299.
42. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:266, p. 612.
43. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:41, p. 1297.
44. Nu'mānī, M. Manzūr, *Tadkīkah Imām Rabbānī*, op. cit., p. 123. It is strange that Shaykh Muhammād Ikram attributes the poetic surname *kufīr* to Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī himself without giving his source (*Muslim Civilisation in India*, New York and London, Columbia University Press, 1964, p. 167). This must be treated as a mistake.
45. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. III:41, p. 1298.
46. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:288, p. 722.
47. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:261, p. 573.
48. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:266, p. 626; II:62, p. 1061.
49. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:260, p. 562. *Fard* means acts which are obligatory, and Sunnah means acts which were done by the Prophet and recommended by him without making them obligatory. Though general in their application the words here refer to prayers.
50. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. II:28, pp. 921–2.
51. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:41, p. 1306.
52. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:276, p. 573.
53. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:261, p. 573.
54. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:294, p. 776; II:58, p. 1050.
55. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:232, p. 1050; III:66, p. 1367; I:234, pp. 492–3.
56. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:29, pp. 95–6.
57. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:231, p. 481.
58. For Sirhindī's discussion on innovation (*bi'dat*) see *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I, pp. 186, 231, 19. For a thorough discussion of the subject see Abu

Ishaq 'l-Shāfi'i, *Al-Yiṣām* (Cairo, al-Maktabah 'l-Tijāriyah 1-Kubrā).

59. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. II:54, p. 1032.

60. Nu'māni, M. M., *Tadhkīrah Imām Rabbāni*, op. cit., p. 87.

61. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:102, p. 256.

62. Nu'māni, M. M., *Tadhkīrah Imām Rabbāni*, p. 255; Nadwi, S. A. 'Ali, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 112, 163.

63. Nu'māni, M. M. [i] Tadhkīrah Imām Rabbāni, p. 69.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

65. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:213, p. 425; I:194, p. 389.

66. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:47, p. 163.

67. Nadwi, S. A. 'Ali, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 88–91.

68. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:102, p. 256.

69. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:275, p. 570.

70. For the text of the *Mahdār* see Badayūnī, *Muntakhab 'l-Tawārikh*, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 271–2 and for Eng. translation, M. Mujeeb, *Indian Muslims*, Allen & Unwin, 1967, pp. 242–3.

71. Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964, p. 175.

72. For details of Dīn Ilāhi see Nadwi, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 108–25.

73. See Abū'l-Fadl's assessment of Akbar's religious policy, by Muširūl-Hasan, *Studies in Islam*, Delhi, Vol. X, Jan.–April 1973, p. 119; and Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, op. cit., p. 173.

74. For details see Ikram, Sh. M., *Muslim Civilisation in India*, op. cit., pp. 162–3.

75. Those who were executed for opposing Akbar's religious policy include Mu'allā Mahmud Yazdi, the Shi'ah Qādi of Jawnpur, and Mu'izz 'l-Mulk, the Chief Qādi of Bengal (Ikram, S. M., *Muslim Civilisation in India*, p. 160). Sirhindi refers to persecution and extermination in his letters, Vol. I:47, p. 162 and I:81, p. 225.

76. Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, p. 180; Ikram, S. M., *Muslim Civilisation in India*, p. 163; Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:195, p. 391.

77. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:47, p. 162; I:81, p. 225.

78. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:92, pp. 1129–30.

79. Nizāmi, Khalīq Ahmad, 'Naqshbandi Influence on the Mughal Rulers and Politics', *Islamic Culture*, Jan. 1965, p. 47.

80. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:195, pp. 390–1.

81. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:67, p. 1082.

82. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:53, p. 171.

83. See Sirhindi's *Maktabat*, Vol. I:269, pp. 48, 163, 165, 53, 195, 65; II:57; III:54.

84. Ikram, S. M., *Rawd Kawthar*, op. cit., p. 159.

85. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

86. Some dubbed him as *kāfir* (Nu'māni, M. M., *Tadhkirah Imām Rabbāni*, p. 99) and some called for his hanging (Ikram, Sh. M., *Rawd Kawthar*, p. 162).

87. Ikram, Sh. M., *Rawd Kawthar*, p. 160.

88. Badr 'l-Dīn, *Hadrāt I-Qudus*, pp. 116–17, cited by Nadwi, S. A. 'Ali, *Tārikh Da'wat*, Vol. IV, pp. 162–3.

89. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. III:5, p. 1202; III:2, pp. 1193–4; III:6, p. 1203.

90. Arnold, T. W., *Preaching of Islam*, 2nd revised ed., London, Constable & Company, 1913, p. 412.

91. Ikram, Sh. M., *Rawd Kawthar*, p. 163.

92. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. III:43, pp. 1307–8; III:106, p. 1513; III:72, p. 1378.

93. Aslam, M., *Sarmāyah 'Umar*, op. cit., pp. 128–31; Ikram, Sh. M., *Muslim Civilisation in India*, p. 169.

94. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. II:4, p. 870; I:261, pp. 574–5; I:234, p. 494; III:100, p. 1506.

## Notes and References (Chapter Two)

- The ancestors of Abū 'l-Ḥusayn Ahmad b. Muḥammad 'l-Nūrī's (d. 295/907–8) parents came from Khurasan; but he was born and brought up in Baghdad. A greater devotee (*abīd*) than his more famous friend Junayd, Nūrī was extremely ecstatic, had prolonged trances, and was known for his allegorical expressions (*ishārāt*) some of which have been explained by Abū Naṣr 'l-Sarrāj (*al-Lum'a fi l-Taqawwuf*, ed. Dr. 'Abd 'l-Halīm Māhmūd and Ṭāhā 'Abd 'l-Bāqī Sūrī, (Cairo, 1960), pp. 492–4). See also Abū 'l-Qāsim 'l-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, ed. 'Abd 'l-Halīm Māhmūd and Muḥammad b. 'I-Shārif (Cairo, 1972), pp. 123–4; Al-Kalabādī, *al-Ta'arruf li madhab ahl l-Taqawwuf*, ed. Dr. 'Abd 'l-Halīm Māhmūd and Ṭāhā 'Abd 'l-Bāqī Sūrī, (Cairo, 1960), pp. 96, 100; Hujwīrī, *Kashf l-Mahīb*, ed. V. A. Zukovskiy, Persian translation of the Russian Introduction, by M. 'Abbāsī (Tehran, 1926), pp. 164–6; 'Aṭṭār, *Tadkīrat l-Awliyā'*, with Qazwīnī's Preface (Tehran, 1336, A.H.), Vol. II, pp. 39–47.
- 'Aṭṭār, *Tadkīrat l-Awliyā'*, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 46.
- Abū 'l-Qāsim 'l-Junayd b. Muḥammad (d. 297/909) of Baghdad, the most outstanding Sufi of his time, highly learned, extremely balanced and sober, he strictly observed the Sharī'ah. Sufis hail him as the Leader of the Sufi Community (*Sayyid al-Tā'iyyah*) and trace their *tariqahs* from him. Ibn Taymiyah (d. 728/1327) counts him among the *mashāikh l-Islām* and *ā'immat l-hudā* [*Majmū' Faīwā Shaykh l-Islām*, Riyadh, Vol. X, pp. 516–17]. Dr. 'Alī Ḥassān 'Abd-El-Kāder has published his *Rāzī* in his book, *The Life, Personality and Writings of al-Junayd* (London, Luzac & Co., Gibb Memorial Series, 1962); the late Prof. R. C. Zaehner has a chapter on Junayd's mysticism in his *Hindu and Muslim Mysticism* (Shocken, New York, 1969, 1st ed. 1960), pp. 135–61; I have also studied Junayd's views on mystic experience and *tawhid* in my article 'The Doctrine of One Actor: Junayd's View of *Tawhīd*', *The Muslim World*, Jan. 1983, pp. 33–56.
- Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 552.
- Abū Muḥammad Saḥī b. 'Abdullāh 'l-Tustarī (d. 283/897) is from Tustar in the Persian province of Khuzistan, where he taught Islamic sciences and instructed in Sufism before he came to Basra and settled down. He is known for his abstinence (*wara*), renunciation (*zuhd*), fasting throughout the year and miracles. Al-Ḥallāj was among his disciples. See al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 92–5; 'Aṭṭār: *Tadkīrat l-Awliyā'*; Vol. I, pp. 227–41; Hujwīrī, *Kashf l-Mahīb*, pp. 244ff and 175–6; 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī, *Nafahat l-'Uṣūl* (Lucknow, Nawāliškōre, 1910), p. 69. Walter De Gruyter has studied his Commentary on the Qur'an in *The Mystic Vision of Existence in Classical Islam* (Berlin and New York, 1980).
- 'Aṭṭār; *Tadkīrat l-Awliyā'*, Vol. I, p. 237.
- See the Indian scholar and Sufi, Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī Nadwī, *Tazkīyah wa Iḥṣān yā Taṣawwuf wa Sulūk* (Urdu translation of his original Arabic work: *Rabbāniyah lā Rabibāniyah*) Lucknow, 1979, pp. 14–16, 24; and his colleague, 'Muhammad 'l-Manzūr | Nu'mānī, *Taṣawwuf Kiyā Hay*, (Lucknow, 1978), pp. 24, 33, 65.
- For the difference between the Sufi way and the prophetic way see *infra*: pp. 63–70.
- Abū Ḥamid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (450/1058–505/1111), an eminent Ash'arite theologian, an outstanding Shāfi'iite *fāqīh*, a profound critic of Greek philosophy, and a great defender of the Islamic faith (*Hijjar l-Islām*), was born at Tus in Iran, studied at Nishapur, taught and wrote at the Niẓāmiyah College, Baghdad, and eventually turned to Sufism and interpreted Islam and Sufism so as to bring them together. He has traced his intellectual development in a book *al-Maqāid min l-Dalāl*, which has been translated by M. Watt under the title, *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī* (London, 1951). Different parts of his *magnum opus*, *Iḥyā' 'Ulij l-Dīn* and some other works have been translated into English and other languages. Also a number of works, the greatest on any Islamic personality, have been written on his thought. Al-Ghazālī has expounded his views on gnosis in the *Mizān l-'Amal*, ed. Sulayman Dunya (Cairo, 1964). For a discussion see M. 'Umaruddin: *The Ethical Philosophy of Ima'm Ghazzālī*, Alīgār, 1962.
- Abū Bakr Muhyī 'l-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī 'l-Tā'i, commonly known as Ibn 'Arabī/Ibn 'l-'Arabī (560/1165–638/1240), was born in Murcia (Spain) and died in Damascus. A mystic of vast learning, great intellect and unlimited imagination, he expounded and elaborated the philosophy of *wahdat l-wujūd* that has dominated the Islamic world for centuries and still exercises a considerable influence. For his biography see Sayyid Husain Nasr: *Three Muslim Sages* (Harvard, Cambridge, 1964), pp. 92–102. The best work on his philosophy is Dr. A. E. Affifi, *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyī Dīn Ibn 'Arabī* [Lahore, Ashraf, reprint from C.U.P., ed.].
- Shaykh 'l-Islām Abū Ismā'il 'Abdullāh b. Abī Mansūr Muḥammad 'l-Anṣārī (396/1006–481/1088) was from Herat in Afghanistan. A highly learned Ḥanbālī scholar, a great mystic as well as a theorist of Sufism, a poet and the author of a biographical work on Sufis, his fame primarily rests on a small but very concise treatise on the states and stages of *sulūk*, *Manāzil l-Sā'irin*, on which a number of Commentaries have been written. S. de Laugier de Beaurecœil D.P. has edited two of them, one by al-Firkāwī and the other by al-Iskandarī (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1953 and 1954), and has also published *Khwāja 'Abdullāh Arṣārī, Mystique Ḥanbālī* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965) and other studies. Ibn Qayyim (691/1292–751/1350), the distinguished disciple of Ibn Taymiyah has also written a lengthy Commentary on the *Manāzil* under the title: *Madārij l-Sālikin*, in three volumes (ed. M. Hāmid 'l-Fiqī, Cairo, 1956).
- Abū Maḥfūz Ma'rūf b. Fīroz 'l-Karkhī (d. 200/815) whose Christian parents embraced Islam at the hands of 'Alī b. Mūsā 'l-Ridā, comes from Karkh in the suburbs of Baghdad. Ibn Taymiyah places him

in the group of sober Sufis like Fudayl b. 'Iyād, Sari 'l-Saqatī and Junayd whom he calls *mashā'ikh* 'l-*Islām*, and *a'immat* 'l-*hūdā*. [*Fatīwā Shaykh* 'l-*Islām*, Riyad, Vol. X, pp. 516–17.] See also al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 65–8; Hujwirī, *Kashf* 'l-*Mahjūb*, pp. 141–2; 'Atṭār, *Tadhkirat* 'l-*Awliyā'*, Vol. I, pp. 241–5.

13. Reynold A. Nicholson, *The Mystics of Islam* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966, 1st ed. 1914), p. 1. Ma'rīf 'l-Karkhī's words, whose first part Prof. Nicholson has translated, are: 'al-Tasawwuf *hūwa al-akhdh bi 'l-haqīqīq wa 'l-yās minnā fi aydī 'l-khalāq'. Nicholson translates *haqīqīq* as 'divine realities', which gives it a metaphysical orientation. Though I would not rule out that possibility, I would prefer to translate it as 'realities'. I would take *haqīqīq* in the sense of the internal realities of religious life such as faith, trust, fear, love, patience etc. [see the section on *haqīqah* below]. This would go better with the rest of al-Karkhī's sentence, and would fit the context of his age when the gnostic element in Sufism had not gained much significance.*

14. Titus Burckhardt, *An Introduction to Sufi Doctrine* (Eng. tr. D. M. Matheson) Lahore, Ashraf, 1968, pp. 16, 18. This sentence on page 16 is quite typical: 'Since the doctrine is both the very foundation of the way and fruit of the contemplation which is its goal, the difference between Sufism and religious mysticism can be reduced to a question of doctrine.'

15. Shaykh Muhyī 'l-Dīn 'Abd 'l-Qādir (471/1079–561/1165–66), the founder of the earliest and the most popular Sufi order, was born at Jīlān in Iran. He came to Baghdad at the age of eighteen, devoted himself to the study of the Qur'aan, hadīth and *fīqh*, and completed his *sufiik* under the direction of Shaykh Ḥammād 'l-Dabbās (d. 525/1130). He started delivering sermons at the age of fifty to which thousands of people thronged. His works include *Ghuyyat* 'l-*Talibin*, *Fujūh* 'l-*Ghayb* and *al-Faith* 'l-*Rabbāni*. Ibn Taymiyah wrote a Commentary on part of the *Fujūh* 'l-*Ghayb*, [*Fatīwā Shaykh* 'l-*Islām*, Riyad, Vol. X, pp. 482–9]; Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Haqq Muḥaddith Dīhlawī (d. 1052/1642) translated and commented on it in Persian (Lucknow, Nawalkishor), and Prof. Walther Braune has translated and studied it: *Die Fünf* 'l-*Ghayb* des 'Abd 'l-Qādir (Berlin, Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter, 1933).

16. Shīhāb 'l-Dīn Abī Hāfiṣ 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh b. Amwayh (559/1144–632/1234), the founder of the Suhrāwardī order was the chief Sufi saint (*Shaykh* 'l-*Shuyūkh*) at Baghdad in his time. His preceptor in *sufiik* was his uncle Abū Naṣīb 'l-Suhrāwardī (d. 563/1168) but he also benefited from Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jīlā'i's (d. 561/1166) company. His book '*Awārif* 'l-*Mārif*' is the most popular exposition of the mainstream of Sufism.

17. Bahā' 'l-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad 'l-Bukhārī Naqshband's (d. 791/1389) order is the most popular order next only to the Qādiriyah. Originating in Central Asia, it spread to Bosnia in the west and Sumatra in the east. It is known for avoiding doubtful ways in *sufiik*,

e.g., *Samā'*, *dhuhr* *bī'l-jahr*, and *khalwah*. For the evolution of the Naqshbandī *tariqah* see Hamid Algar: 'Bibliographical Notes on the Naqshbandī *Tariqah*', in *Essays on Islamic Philosophy and Sciences*, ed. G. F. Hourani (Albany, State University of New York, 1975), pp. 254–9. For the life of Shaykh Bahā' 'l-Dīn see Jāmī, *Nafhāt* 'l-'Urs (Lucknow, 1910), pp. 345–9.

18. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 551.

19. Abū Bakr b. Jahdār 'l-Shiblī (247/861–334/946), a disciple of Junayd, was the leading Sufi of his time in Baghdad. In the early part of his career he was extremely emotional and ecstatic. His *shāthāt* and deficatory words, some of which al-Sarrāj has explained (*al-Luma'*, pp. 478–91), come from this period; in practice, however, he observed the Sharī'ah except on some occasions when he was deeply intoxicated. Later on he became sober and proved to be a great Sufi shaykh. (See al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 159–60; Hujwirī, *Kashf* 'l-*Mahjūb*, pp. 195–7; 'Atṭār, *Tadhkirat* 'l-*Awliyā'*, Vol. II, pp. 135–54; Jāmī, *Nafhāt* 'l-'Urs, pp. 174–8. For Ibn Taymiyah's comments on him see *Fatīwā Shaykh* 'l-*Islām*, Riyad, Vol. X, pp. 382, 557.)

20. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 554.

21. Abū 'Ali Juṣījānī was a disciple of Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Hakīm 'l-Tirmidhī (d. 216/831). 'Atṭār ascribes these words to him: 'Try to consistently observe the Sharī'ah, and do not go after miracles (*karāmah*)' [*Tadhkirat* 'l-*Awliyā'*, II, p. 101].

22. Jāmī, *Nafhāt* 'l-'Urs, p. 4.

23. 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492), a great scholar, mystic, philosopher and poet, was born at Jam in Khurasan. Besides many distinguished works in poetry, Jāmī wrote a large Commentary on the *Fusūṣ* 'l-*Hikam* of Ibn 'l-Arabi and a short one, *Naqd* 'l-*Nuṣūṣ*, an exposition of the basic doctrines of *wahdat* 'l-*wujūd*; *Lawā'ih*, partly in prose and partly in verse; a work on theology, *Al-Durrat* 'l-*Fākihah* [published with 'Abd 'l-Ghafur 'l-Lārī's Commentary, ed. N. Heer and A. Musawi Behbahani, Tehran 1980]; and an introduction to the lives and teachings of almost 600 Sufis, *Nafhāt* 'l-'Urs. [For his poetry, see: A. J. Arberry: *Classical Persian Literature* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1958), pp. 425–50.]

24. Jāmī, *Nafhāt* 'l-'Urs, p. 4.

25. Sirhindī, *Maktubāt*, Vol. I:135, p. 308; I:97, p. 241.

26. Shāh Wali Allāh (1141/1702–1176/1762), a great renovator (*muṣādīd*) of Islam in the eighteenth century, was born into a distinguished family of Delhi. An eminent scholar of hadīth, a great Sufi and social thinker, Wali Allāh expounded the whole system of Islam in his *Hujjat* 'l-*Allāh* 'l-*Bālitgāh*, and elaborated its ethics and polity in *al-Budūr* 'l-*Bāzīghāh* and *Izāla* 'l-*Khīfā*), and wrote on Islamic theology and philosophy. He also wrote on *fīqh*, *tafsīr*, and hadīth. In Sufism he tried to introduce a stronger transcendental element in the framework of *wahdat* 'l-*wujūd*. For Wali Allāh's life see his autobiography appended to his *Anfās* 'l-*wujūd*. For Wali Allāh's life see his *Anfās* 'l-*Ārfin* (Delhi, 1897);

Muhammad Rahim Bakhtsh, *Hayāt Wali*, Lahore, 1955; G. N. Jibānī, *Life of Shah Wali Allāh* (Delhi, Idārah-i-Adabiyyat-i-Delhi, 1980); Rizvi, S. A. A., *Wali Allāh and His Time* (Canberra, Ma'rifat Publishing House, 1980).

27. Wali Allāh, *al-Qawl 'l-Jamīl*, (text with Urdu tr. by Khurram 'Alī Deoband, Aziziyah), pp. 27–34.

28. Al-Qur'ān, 57:4.

29. *Ibid.*, 2:115.

30. *Ibid.*, 50:16.

31. *Ibid.*, 28:88.

32. Al-Ghazālī, *Miskāt 'l-Anwār*, ed. A. E. 'Affifi (Cairo, Dār 'l-Qawmiya, 1964), pp. 57–8.

33. 'Abd 'l-Karīm b. Hawāzin 'l-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072), a disciple of Abū 'Alī 'l-Daqqāq (d. 405/1014) in Sufism, is famous for his *al-Risālah* which is the most authentic and comprehensive introduction to Sufi practices, experiences and concepts as developed by early Sufis. Al-Qushayrī has a Commentary on the Qur'ān *Lajā'if 'l-Ishā'ī*, and other works.

34. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 226–7.

35. Abū Yazid b. Tayfīr b. 'Isā 'l-Bistāmī (d. 261/875), one of the founders of Sufism, hailed from Bistām, a town in the Iranian province of Khamis. He is famous for his ecstatic experiences and *shāfi'āt*. Al-Sahlajī, a fifth-century writer, has collected his words in a book entitled: *Al-Nūr min Kalimat Abī Tayfīr*, which has been published by Dr. 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Badawi with some other writings under the name: *Shāfi'āt 'l-Šūfiyyah* [Kuwait, 1976]. R. C. Zaehner has a chapter on his experience and thought in his *Hindu and Muslim Mysticism* [New York, Schocken, 1969]; I have also studied Abū Yazid's *tariqah*, experience and *shāfi'āt* in a paper: 'Abū Yazid 'l-Bistāmī's Description of Mystical Experience', *Hamard Islamicus* (Karachi), Vol. VI, No. 2, Summer 1983), pp. 25–55.

36. My paper on Abū Yazid, *op. cit.*

37. Al-Sahlajī, *Al-Nūr min Kalimat Abī Tayfīr*, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

38. Ibn 'l-Arabi, *Rasū'il*, Hyderabad (India), *Risālah La Ya'ūlū 'alayhi*, p. 8.

39. Ibn 'l-Arabi, *al-Fuūhāt 'l-Makkiyah* (Beirut, Dār Sadir, n.d.), Vol. II, Ch. 221, P. 516; in the *Risālah*, *La Ya'ūlū 'alayhi* (*op. cit.*, p. 14), he says: 'Every vision that does not show you multiplicity in One Being (*al-'ayn 'l-wāhidiyah*) is not to be counted upon.'

40. Wali Allāh tries to distinguish between *al-wujūd 'l-munbiṣṭ* and 'God' in order to do justice to God's transcendence [see his *Al-ṭarīq 'l-Qudus*, Matba' Ahmadī, Delhi, 1305, pp. 53–6; *Lamḥāt*, ed. Dr. Ghulām Muṣṭafā, Shāh Wali Allāh Academy, Hyderabad (Pakistan), pp. 18–25; *Hama'āt*, same ed. and publisher, 1964, pp. 69–77; and *Al-Taqhimat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, same ed. and publisher, 1967, Vol. II, pp. 274–5].

41. Wali Allāh, *Taqhimat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 263.

42. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:291, p. 761.

43. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:272, p. 656.

44. Al-Sarrāj, *Al-Luma'*, *op. cit.*, p. 479.

45. Abū Ḥamzah (d. 269/882) was another ecstatic friend of Junayd. What suggests his eventual sobriety is these words of his which al-Qushayrī records: 'There is no way to God except to follow the Prophet in his states (*ahwālih*), acts and words.' [al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, P. 150.]

46. Husayn ibn Mansūr 'l-Hallāj (244/857–309/922), the 'intoxicated' Sufi *per excellence* was from a town near Shiraz. He was executed at Baghdad, one of the many charges against him being his saying: 'I am God (*Anā 'l-Ḥaqqa'*). What distinguishes him from the no less ecstatic Sufi, Abū Yazid 'l-Bistāmī [see note 35] is that he, unlike the latter, expounded doctrines on the basis of his experience which openly contradicted Islamic beliefs. The most outstanding French scholar of Sufism, Louis Massignon has published al-Hallāj's works such as *al-Tawāṣīn* and *Dīwān*, and discussed his life and teachings in *La Passion d'al-Hallāj* which has been rendered in English by Prof. Herbert Mason: *The Passion of al-Hallāj* (Bollingen Series, Princeton University Press, 1982).

47. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. III:33, pp. 1282–3.

48. For translation of the letter see *infra*: pp. 202–6.

49. Muhammad 'Abd 'l-Shakūr, a Sufi of the Mujaddidiyah *silsilah* (which is a branch of the Naqshbandiyah following the teachings of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī), says that the Naqshbandi *nisbat* means 'the ever alive consciousness of God's presence in which one does not lose sight of God even for a moment' [*Tadzhīrah Majādīyah Alf Thāni*, ed. M. Manzūr Ahmad Nu'māni (Lucknow, 1982), p. 226].

50. Al-Sahlajī, *Al-Nūr min Kalimat Abī Tayfīr*, p. 165.

51. Abū 'l-Makārim Ahmād b. Muhammād 'l-Simnāni (657/1261–736/1336) came from a noble family of Baybakan in Tabriz. He joined government service at the age of fifteen, but left it later when a heavenly voice admonished him. He then went to Simnan and devoted himself to *dhi'kīr* and *sulūk* under the guidance of Sharif 'l-Dīn Sa'dullāh Simnāni. After seventeen years he got *khirqah*, went to Baghdad and stayed in the company of 'Abd 'l-Razzāq Isfrāīnī, the teacher of Sa'dullāh Simnāni, for thirty-two years. He wrote many books; the most important is *al-'Urwah li 'ahl 'l-khalwah* [Mss. in Bankipur Khuda Baksh Library, Patna] in which he upholds God's absolute transcendence.

52. Kamāl 'l-Dīn 'Abd 'l-Razzāq Kāshī (d. 730/1329), a firm believer in *wahdat l-wujūd*, is famous for his Commentary on the *Fusūṣ 'l-Hikam* of Ibn 'l-Arabi, and his book, *Isṭilāhāt 'l-Šūfiyyah* on Sufi terms. His Commentary on the Qur'an where he applies the principles of *wahdat l-wujūd* with little regard for language has been wrongly attributed to Ibn 'l-Arabi [see Jāmī, *Nafāhāt 'l-Urs*, p. 429].

53. Al-Qur'ān, 15:99.

54. The reference is to Shaykh 'Abdullāh 'l-Anṣārī 'l-Harwī (see note 11).

55. Jāmī, *Nafāhāt 'l-Urs*, pp. 437–40.

56. Al-Simnānī, *Al-Urwah li Ahl 'l-Khalwah*, *op. cit.*, Ch. I.

57. See note 3.

58. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 24, 285; Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Mahjūb*, p. 360.

59. 'Abd 'l-Qādir 'l-Jilānī, *Futūh 'l-Ghayb* (Cairo, Halabi, 1973), Ch. 60, p. 138.

60. 'Abdullāh 'l-Anṣārī, *Manāzil 'l-Sā'irin* with Commentary by Iskandarī, *op. cit.*, p. 227; Jāmī, *Nafahāt 'l- Uns*, pp. 15–16.

61. Al-Qur'ān, 11:56.

62. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. II:95, p. 1137.

63. Al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, p. 283; al-Suhrawardī, 'Awārif 'l-Ma'ārif (Beirut, Dār 'l-Kutub 'l-'Arabī, 1966), pp. 524–5; Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Mahjūb*, pp. 328–9.

64. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. II:95, p. 1139.

65. Ibn 'l-Fārid (586/1181–632/1235) from Cairo is the greatest mystical poet in Arabic. His masterpiece is the great *Taiyāh* (ode rhyming in 'r') that has 760 couplets. Prof. Nicholson has rendered most of it along with other couplets from his *Diwān* into English and commented on them. [See his *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 1st ed. 1921, reprint, Delhi, 1976, pp. 162–266.] See also Dr. Muhammad Muṣṭafā Hilmī, *Ibn 'l-Fārid wa 'l-Hubb 'l-Iḥlāḥ* (Cairo, Dār 'l-Ma'ārif, 1971).

66. See *Le Diwan d'I-Hallâj*, (ed.) Louis Massignon, Paris, 1955.

67. Jalāl 'l-Dīn Rūmī (604/1207–672/1273) was born at Balkh. His father brought him to Konia in Asia Minor. A most gifted poet, and a great Sufi and the eponymous founder of the Malawī order of Dervishes, his fame rests on his immortal *Ma'nawī*, a superb exposition of his Sufi theosophy in verse. It has been fully translated and commented by Prof. Nicholson. His other works include *Diwān-i-Shams Tabriz*, a collection of lyrical poems, and *Fihī mā fihī*, a posthumous compilation of his discourses on religious and mystical topics. [For his poetry see A. J. Arberry: *The Classical Persian Literature*, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–41, and for his theosophical ideas, R. A. Nicholson: *Rumi: The Mystic*, London; Khalīfah 'Abdul Hakīm, *The Metaphysics of Rumi*, Lahore, 1978; and Afzal Iqbāl, *The Life and Thought of Rumi*, Lahore, Institute of Islamic Culture, 1978.]

68. Farid 'l-Dīn Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm Atṭār (1136–1230), one of the 'pillars' of Persian mystical poetry, is the author of more than a dozen works including some beautiful *mathnawis*; *Aṣrār Nāmah* on general Sufi principles, *İlahî Nāmah* on mystical love, *Muṣībat Nāmah* on the ascension of the spirit, and the most celebrated allegory, *Manṭiq 'l-Tayr* (*Speech of the Birds*) wherein he portrays the progress of the mystic towards union with God. [Trans. in French by G. de Tassy (Paris, 1857), and in English by E. Fitzgerald (Boston, 1899).] His *Tadhibat 'l-Awliyā'* (2 vols.) is a highly esteemed work on the life and teaching of about a hundred eminent Sufis [See Brown, E. G., *A Literary History of Persia*, Cambridge, 1969, Vol. II, pp. 507–14; Arberry A. J., *Classical Persian Literature*, London, Allen & Unwin, reprint 1967, pp. 129–38; Sa'd Nafīsī, *Justujū dar*

*dhwāl wa āthār-i-Fārid 'l-Dīn 'Atṭār*, Tehran, 1942.]

69. See Affīfī, A. E., *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyīd Dīn Ibn 'Arabī*, Lahore, Ashraf, reprint, [1st ed. C.U.P., 1938], pp. 149–70; Ibn Taymiyah: *Majmū'i at 'l-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, ed. Rashīd Ridā, Cairo [hereafter referred to as *al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*], Vol. V, pp. 42–3; *infra*, pp. 107–8, 132.

70. Al-Kalābādhī, *al-Ta'arruf*, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

71. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 518.

72. Nadwī, Abū 'l-Hasan 'Alī, *Tārīkh Da'wat wa 'Azīmat*, Lucknow, *Majlis Tahqīqāt wa Nashriyāt-i-Islām*, Nadwat 'l-Ulamā', 1980, Vol. IV, p. 35.

73. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. III:33, p. 1283.

74. Al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, pp. 453–4, 422–3.

75. *Ibid.*, pp. 461, 423. For his discussion of the *Shayhāt* of Abū Yazid, al-Shiblī, al-Nūrī and Abū Ḥānzah see his *al-Luma'*, pp. 459–77, 478–91, 492–4, and 495–6 respectively.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 479.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 458.

78. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:266, p. 589; I:130, p. 330.

79. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:95, p. 236.

80. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:95, p. 237.

81. Jāmī says that Abū 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Jaṭṭār 'l-Kharqānī (d. 425/1034) 'followed the way of Abū Yazid 'l-Bistāmī in *tasawwuf* and was immersed in love and *fana'*. He quotes him as saying: 'One is not a Sufi by rugged clothes, or the prayer mat, nor even by observing rules (*rasm*) and cultivating good habits (*adab*). A Sufi is one who ceases to be.' [*Nafahāt 'l-Uns*, pp. 275–6.]

82. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:152, pp. 325–7.

83. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:100, pp. 251–2. Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Kabīr Yamāni lived mostly at Makkah. One day he shocked his audience with these words, and then offered this explanation: 'Everything is known to God, and nothing is unknown (*ghayb*) to Him. Since there is no *ghayb*, there can be no knowledge of *ghayb*. When the Qur'ān says that God knows the hidden ('ālim 'l-*ghayb*), it uses *ghayb* in relation to us [*Rashahāt* as quoted by Nūr Muḥammad in the footnote, *Maktabat*, p. 251].

84. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 233.

85. Al-Kalābādhī, *al-Ta'arruf*, p. 131.

86. Shaykh 'Abd 'l-Qādir is reported to have said: Al-Hallāj stumbled because he did not get anyone who could hold him. Had I been in his time I would have held his hand.' [Qādī 'Iyād, *Al-Shifā'*, with Commentary, *Nasīm 'l-Riyād*, Madīnah, Al-Maktubāt 'l-Saffiyah, n.d., p. 538.]

87. Sirhindī, *Maktabat*, Vol. III:33, p. 1283.

88. Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Maḥīb*, p. 235.

89. See my paper, 'Abū Yazid 'l-Bistāmī's Description of the Mystic Experience', *op. cit.*, pp. 35–6.

90. Sirhindī, *Makṭubāt*, Vol. II:95, p. 1138.

91. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:41, p. 144.

92. Al-Kalābādī, *al-Ta'arruf*, p. 91. Abū 'Abdullāh Sa'īd b. Yazīd 'l-Nībājī, the teacher of Abū 'l-Husayn Ahmād b. Abī 'Alī 'l-Hawārī (d. 230/844) mentioned by al-Qushayrī in his *Risālah* (P. 105), stressed good morals and manners (*adab*) in Sufism [Jāmī, *Nafahāt 'l-Urs*, p. 92].

93. Al-Sahlajī, *Kalimāt Abī Tayfūr*, p. 131.

94. Al-Kalābādī, *al-Ta'arruf*, p. 134.

95. Al-Suhrawardī, 'Awārif 'l-Ma'ārif', p. 515. Dhu 'l-Nūn, Thawbān b. Ibrāhīm (d. 245/859), the famous Egyptian Sufi, was a friend and admirer of Abū Yazīd 'l-Bistāmī. Prof. Nicholson is of the opinion that he has influenced the course of Sufism more than Abū Yazīd or any other Sufi of his time ['A Historical Enquiry Concerning the Origin and Development of Sufism', *JRAS*, 1906, pp. 203–48].

96. Ibn 'l-'Arabī, *Al-Futūhāt 'l-Makkiyah*, Vol. II, p. 509.

97. Al-Sahlajī, *Kalimāt Abī Tayfūr*, p. 157.

98. Al-Suhrawardī, 'Awārif 'l-Ma'ārif', p. 541.

99. Al-Sahlajī, *Kalimāt Abī Tayfūr*, p. 184.

100. Al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, p. 464.

101. Al-Sahlajī, *Kalimāt Abī Tayfūr*, p. 128.

102. *Ibid.*, pp. 91, 143.

103. *Ibid.*, p. 160.

104. *Ibid.*, p. 122.

105. *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 159, 91, 143.

106. Sirhindī, *Makṭubāt*, Vol. II:99, p. 1172.

107. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:87, p. 1558.

108. Al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, p. 545.

109. Sirhindī, *Makṭubāt*, Vol. I:240, pp. 503–4.

110. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 585; Aṭṭār: *Tadhibat 'l-Awliyā'*, Vol. II:365; Ibn 'Taymiyah doubts the authenticity of attributing these words to Abū Bakr 'l-Siddiq [see *Majmū'at 'l-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, ed. Rashid Rida, Cairo, Vol. IV, pp. 54–5].

111. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 169, 23.

112. Sirhindī, *Makṭubāt*, Vol. I:266, p. 589; I:130, p. 330.

113. Hujwīrī (d. 465/1072) says that he met Abū 'l-Qāsim 'Alī Gurgānī at Tus, and learned many things from his discourses. He categorises him with Abū Sa'īd Abū 'l-Khayr (d. 440/1049) and Abū 'l-Abbās Shāqqānī who admired al-Hallāj [*Kashf 'l-Mahjūb*, pp. 55, 189].

114. Al-Ghazālī, *Al-Maqṣad 'l-Asnā fī Sharḥ Asmā' Allāh 'l-Husnā* (Cairo, Maktabat 'l-Jundi, n.d.), p. 45.

115. Al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, pp. 541–2, 543, 552.

116. Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 225, 229–30, 260.

117. Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Mahjūb*, pp. 315–17, 327, 334.

118. Nicholson, R. A., *Mystics of Islam*, op. cit., p. 149.

119. See my paper: 'Abū Yazīd 'l-Bistāmī's Description of the Mystical Experience', op. cit., p. 36.

120. Sirhindī, *Makṭubāt*, Vol. I:30, pp. 100–1.

### Notes and References (Chapter Three)

1. Christian influence has been pointed out by Adalbert Merx, *Ideen und Grundlinien einer allgemeinen Geschichte der Mystic* (Heidelberg, 1893), Margaret Smith, *Rabī'a, The Mystic* (Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1928). The Iranian influence has been emphasised by F. R. D. Tholuck, *Sufismus sive theologia persica pantheistics* (Berlin, 1921), and E. H. Palmer, *Oriental Mysticism* (1867, reprinted London 1969), Henri Corbin and Husain Nasr.
- The Neo-Platonic influence has been brought out by R. A. Nicholson, *The Mystics of Islam* (1914, reprint, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966); he has also pointed out the Buddhist influence. The Vedantic influence has been underlined by Alfred von Kremer, *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge auf dem Gebiete des Islams*, (1873), Eng. tr. Khuda Bakhsh, *Islamic Civilization*, Vol. I (Calcutta, 1929); W. Jones, *Asiatic Researches* (London, 1803); Max Herten, *Indische Stromungen*; R. C. Zaehner, *Hindu and Muslim Mysticism* (1960, New York, Schocken, 1969).
- L. Massignon's most important work on this issue is *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane* (Paris, 1928). Prof. A. Schimmel subscribes to the same view, *Mystical Dimension of Islam* (University of North Carolina, 1975). Most Muslim scholars take the same line: Dr. M. Iqbāl; *The Development of Metaphysics in Persia* (Lahore, Bazm-i-Iqbāl), Husain Nasr in his various books, etc., Dr. Mir Valiuddin even derives *wahdat i-wujūd* from the Qur'ān; see his *Qur'ānic Sufism* (Hyderabad, Academy of Islamic Studies, 1959).
- Ignaz Goldzher, *Vorlesungen über des Islam* (1925) pp. 87–133; and Nicholson, *The Mystics of Islam*, op. cit., and 'A Historical Enquiry Concerning the Origin and Development of Sufism', *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, (1906) pp. 203–48, differentiate between the two aspects of Sufism.
- The distinction between *al-tasawwuf i-sunnī* and *al-tasawwuf i-fāfi* is made by Dr. 'Abd i-Qādir Mahmūd, *al-Falsafah i-Sufiyah fi l-Islām* (Cairo, Dār i-Fikr i-'Arabi, 1967), Dr. Abū 'l-Wafā 'I-Ghanimī 'i-Taftāzāni, *al-Madkhil išā 'l-Tasawwuf i-Islāmi* (Cairo, 1976), and Dr. Ibrāhīm Madkūr Buyūni, *Fī 'l-Faṣṣafat i-Islāmiyah, Manhajihū wa Tathbiqihū* (Cairo, n.d.).
- Titus Burckhardt: *An Introduction to Sufi Doctrine*, Eng. tr. D. M. Matheson (Lahore 1959; Lahore, Ashraf, 1968), Frithjof Schuon, *The Transcendental Unity of Religions*, Eng. tr. Peter Townsend (London, Faber & Faber, 1953).
- These two passages from Abū Nasr 'I-Sarrāj's *al-Luma'*, op. cit., are typical. 'The Sūfīs are God's trustees on earth, the guardians of His secrets and knowledge, and the cream of His creation. They are the chosen ones of God, noblest friends, and the most loved ones; the *muṭtaqūn*, the *sābiqūn*, the *abrār*, the *muqarrabūn*, the *abdāl* and the *ṣiddiqūn* all come from them' [p. 19].
- 'The Sūfīs do not choose one branch of knowledge and leave the others [as people devoted to *hadīth*, *fīqh* and *zuhd* do]; nor do they limit themselves to the attainment of some states and stations (*akhwā wa maqāmat*) leaving out the others. They are the mines of all kinds of knowledge, the models for all noble states (*al-ayyāħ i-maħmūrah*) and the embodiments of all sublime virtues (*akhlāq i-sharīfah*), old as well as new' [p. 40]. See also al-Oushayrī, *al-Risālah*, op. cit., pp. 20–1; Abū Nu'aym, *Hilyat i-Awliyā'* (Beirut, n.d.), Vol. I, pp. 21–8.
- Al-Kalābādhī particularly tries to show that the beliefs which the Sūfīs hold are not different from the beliefs of the *Ahl i-Sunnah* [*Al-Ta'arrufi-Madhhab ahl i-Taqawwuf*, op. cit., Ch. V, pp. 33–82].
- Ibid.*, pp. 84–6; al-Sarrāj, *al-Luma'*, pp. 105–46.
- Al-Sarrāj has a whole section in *al-Luma'* [pp. 453–515] on the *shāfi'iyyāt* and the *išārāt* of the Sūfīs, wherein he tries to show that although they appear to conflict with the Shari'ah, they do not really do so. He also has another section [pp. 516–55] wherein he mentions the mistaken ideas of some Sūfīs.
- To justify this remark on the *ḥiyā* 'Ulūm 'i-Dīn I would need a whole volume. However, these few words may be offered for consideration. Al-Ghazālī attempts in the *ḥiyā* to present the whole system of Islamic faith and beliefs, worship and rites (Vol. I); social life and economic pursuits (Vol. II); morality and purification of the soul (Vol. III); and the virtues of religion and spirit (Vol. IV). In working out his book he draws upon everything – the Qur'ān, ḥadīth, *fīqh*, the words of the elders and the sayings and practices of the Sūfīs. But the basic conceptual framework which underlies the whole book, shapes the discussion and determines the conclusions, is formed by his ideas on three fundamental issues: knowledge, happiness (*sa'ādah*) and reality. In the formation of these ideas, the foremost and decisive role is played by al-Ghazālī's philosophical beliefs, and his understanding of Sufism as well as his own Sufi practices. In order to appreciate this point one may refer to al-Ghazālī's autobiography: *Munqidh min i-Dalāl* [Eng. tr. M. Watt, *The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazālī*, op. cit.], M. 'Umaruddin: *The Ethical Philosophy of Imaam Ghazālī* (Aligarh, 1962), Dr. 'Ali 'Isā Uthmān, *Al-Insān iñd i-Ghazālī*, Arabic trans. Khayrī Hammād (Cairo, Anjālī, n.d.), M. 'Abdul Haq Ansari, 'The Doctrine of Divine Command: A Study in the Development of Ghazālī's View of Reality', *Islamic Studies*, Vol. XXI, No. 3, Autumn 1982, pp. 1–47.
- See *infra*, pp. 73–4.
- Ibn 'I-Ārabi has performed this function on a large scale in his lengthy work *al-Futūħ i-Makkiyah*. He interprets here the whole gamut of Islamic beliefs and practices in the light of his philosophy of *wahdat i-wujūd*. He also offers here another interpretation of things which is closer to the view which an ordinary Muslim or a theologian takes. That obviously does not represent his real thought, a more clear exposition of which, particularly on the most fundamental issues, is found in his *Fuṣūq i-Hikam* which contains the essence of his philosophy.

13. See *infra*, pp. 130–8.

14. The self-criticism of the Sufis prior to Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi has been directed mostly to two kinds of issues: One which may be called the deviations of individual Sufis, such as those which al-Sarrāj has discussed in *al-Luma'* (see note 9). Other issues concern matters of detail, such as the practice of *sanā'ī*, *rāqs*, *dhikr* with loud voice (*bi-l-jahr*) etc.

What Dr. 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Badawī has written in the chapter on 'Self-Criticism in *Tārikh 'l-Taṣawwuf 'l-Islāmi'*' [Kuwait, 1975], pp. 83–95, only supports our contention.

15. See *ultra*, pp. 47–8.

16. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:301, p. 794.

17. The words *sulūk* and *jadhb* or *jadhibah* at times refer to the effort of the Sufi to travel the Sufi path to God, and God's pulling of the Sufi towards Himself. But what Sirhindi means by these words here is something different. By *sulūk* he means the Sufi's whole course of *dhikr* and meditation leading up to the experience of absorption and *fana'*; on the other hand by *jadhbah* he means the emotional aspects of this pursuit – love, absorption, ecstasy and intoxication.

18. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:313, p. 826.

19. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 796.

20. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 796.

21. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 796.

22. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 796.

23. Al-Kalābādhi, *al-Ta'arruf*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

24. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:302, p. 797.

25. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 798.

26. Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd b. Naṣr 'l-Tā'i (d. 166/782), one of the earliest Sufis of Kufah, learned *fiqh* from Imām Abū Ḥanifah, and *sulūk* from Ḥabib Ra'i. His words which Sirhindi quotes have been mentioned by Jāmī (*Naqiḥat l-'Uṣn*, p. 42); see also Aṭṭār, *Tadhkirat l-Awliyā'*, Vol. I, pp. 200–4.

27. This is a very common theme in Rābi'ah 'l-Adawiyah's (d. 185/801) saying, the most famous woman saint of Basra. The words to which Sirhindi refers are: 'I am going to light a fire in Paradise and pour water on Hell, so that both veils may completely disappear from the pilgrims, and their purpose may be sure, and the servants of God may see Him, without any object of hope or motive of fear.' (Margaret Smith, *Readings from the Mystics of Islam* [London, Luzac & Co. 1972, pp. 10–11]. The same author has also studied her in *Rābi'a, The Mystic, and Her Fellow Saints in Islam* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1974).

28. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:302, pp. 799–800.

29. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:302, p. 796.

30. Wali Allāh, *Hujjar 'Allāh 'l-Bālighah* (Cairo, Dār 'l-Kutub 'l-Hadīth, n.d.) Vol. I, pp. 109–10.

31. Wali Allāh, *Hama'at*, ed. Nūrul Ḥaq 'Alawī and Ghulām Muṣṭafā (Shāh Wali Allāh Academy, Hyderabad, Pakistan, 1964), pp. 16–17.

32. Wali Allāh, *Fuyūḍ 'l-Haramayn*. Arabic text with Urdu trans. (Deoband, Rahimiyāh), p. 50; see also P. 51.

33. Shāh Muḥammad Ismā'il (1198/1779–1246/1830), the grandson of Shāh Wali Allāh studied Islamic sciences with his two uncles, Shāh 'Abd 'l-Azīz and Shāh Rafī 'l-Dīn, and completed his *sulūk* under the direction of Sayyed Ahmad of Brayli (1201/1786–1246/1831), with whom he tried to resist Sikh power in north India, restore Muslim dominance and establish an Islamic state. They did not succeed and lost their lives in the struggle. Shāh Ismā'il and his Shaykh tried to purify Sufism and bring it closer to the Qur'ān and Sunnah. The *Širā'i-Mustaqim* is based upon the discourses of the Shaykh and is very helpful in understanding the difference between the Sufi and the prophetic ways.

34. Shāh Ismā'il, *Širā'i-Mustaqim* (Meerut, Maṭba' Dayā'i), p. 10.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 15–18.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 10–11.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 11. *Shugħi/bərzakh* probably means meditation on the Sufi teacher (*taṣawwur shaykh*). An initiate is required in some *tariqahs* first to engage in this intermediary (*barzakh*) exercise before he takes up meditation on God.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.

51. *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 43–5.

52. The Qur'anic verse 45:18, uses Sharī'ah in its wider sense of the Prophet's entire religion, and verse 42:13 employs the verb *shara'a* for saying that God has prescribed the law and the religion. Ibn Taymiyah testifies that the words *al-Shar'* and *al-Sharī'ah* at times mean the Qur'ān and the Sunnah [*Al-Furqān bayn Awliyā' l-Rahmān wa Awliyā' l-Shayṭān*, Dār 'l-Fikr, Beirut, n.d., p. 145].

53. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:36, p. 115.

54. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:23, pp. 1246–7.

55. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:23, p. 1251.

56. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:55, p. 1044.

*'Ithām mužhir kamālat khafiyah-i-dīn ast na muhibbit kamālat-i-zā'idah dar dīn.*

57. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:55, P. 1043; I:209, p. 416; I:266, p. 607; I:112, p. 269.

58. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:112, p. 270.

59. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:31, p. 100.

60. Al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm 'I-Dīn* (Cairo, Muṣṭafā 'I-Ḥalabī, 1939), Vol. I, pp. 10–11.

61. Al-Ghazālī, *Munqidh min ḥ-Dalāl*, ed. Dr. 'Abd 'I-Halim Mahmūd (Cairo, Maktabat 'I-Anjāl, 1964), p. 13, and *Al-Maqṣad 'I-Sna fi Sharḥ Asnā 'Allāh 'I-Husnā* (Cairo, al-Jundi), p. 151. See my paper: 'The Doctrine of Divine Command: A Study in the Development of Ghazālī's View of Reality', *Islamic Studies*, Vol XXI, No. 3, Autumn 1982, pp. 22–4.

62. Ibn 'I-Arabi: *al-Futuḥah 'I-Makkiyah* (Beirut, Dār Sadir, n.d.), Vol. I, Ch. 65, pp. 319–20.

63. See *infra*, p. 58.

64. Shihāb 'I-Dīn Suhrawardī, 'Awārif 'I-Ma'arif, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 449.

66. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:276, pp. 673–4.

67. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:276, p. 674.

68. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:276, p. 674.

69. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:276, p. 673.

70. Abu Nu'aym, *Hilyat 'I-Awliyā'* (Beirut, n.d.) Vol. X, p. 278; Al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, p. 106.

71. Sulaymān b. 'Ali 'I-Tilmisānī (d. 690/1291), a talented poet and a Sufi, firmly believed in *wahdat 'I-wujūd*. His *dīwān* consists of beautiful poems in which he sings of union and unity. He also wrote a Commentary on the *Manāzil 'I-Sā'in* of Shaykh 'Abdullāh 'I-Anṣārī. He was charged with *zandqah* and *ihlād*; Jāmi, however, defends him on the ground that what he composed or said reflects his experience of union (*jām*) rather than his faith. [Jāmi, *Nafahāt 'I-Urs*, *op. cit.*, pp. 517–18.]

72. Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū'at 'I-Rasā'il wa 'I-Masā'il*, (Cairo, Lajnat 'I-Turāth 'I-'Arabī), Vol. I, p. 177.

73. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. II:55, p. 1041.

74. Ibn 'I-Arabi, *al-Futuḥah 'I-Makkiyah*, *op. cit.*, Vol. III:310, pp. 38–9.

75. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:156, p. 254.

76. Abū 'Abdullāh 'I-Ḥāfiẓ b. Asad 'I-Muhaṣibī (d. 243/857), a leading Sufi of Baghdad, is known for his writings on Sufi psychological ethics, particularly motivation. *Al-Ri'āyah li huquq Allāh* is his best work. Margaret Smith has studied his ideas in her *Al-Muḥāṣibī: An Early Mystic of Baghdad* (Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1935).

77. Abū Ishaq 'I-Shāfiī, *al-Fiqīḥ* (Cairo, al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyah al-Kubrā), Vol. II, pp. 340–55.

78. *Musnad Darīmī*, Kitāb 'I-Buyū', 2; and *Musnad Imām Aḥmad*, Vol. IV, p. 228.

79. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:31, p. 104.

80. Important books on the subject are: Abū Ishaq 'I-Shāfiī, *al-Muwāfaqāt*, ed. 'Abd 'I-Allāh Darraz (Cairo, al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyah 'I-Kubrā, n.d.), particularly Vol. II; Ibn 'Abd 'I-Salām: *Qawā'id 'I-Āhkam fi Masā'il 'I-Anām* (Dār 'I'l, 1980); Wali Allāh, *Hujjat 'Allāh 'I-Baīghah* (Cairo), and *al-Budūr 'I-Baīghah* (Surat,

Maṭlis 'Ilmī, n.d.). Al-Ghazālī's *al-Muṣṭafā* (Cairo, Ḥalabī, reprint from al-Amīriyyah, ed., 1322 A.H.) has also a few pages (Vol. I, pp. 284–314) relevant to the subject.

81. The basic writings on *Akhlaq* in Arabic are those of Miskawayh (325/936–421/1030) and al-Fārābī (d. 339/950). For a study of Miskawayh's ideas see my book, *The Ethical Philosophy of Miskawayh* (Aligarh Muslim University, 1963) and *The Moral Philosophy of al-Fārābī* (Aligarh, 1964). Persian works on *Akhlaq* by Naṣīr 'I-Dīn Ṭūsī (d. 672/1273), *Akhlaq Jālī*, and Jalāl 'I-Dīn Dawwānī (d. 908/1502), *Akhlaq Jālī*, are based upon Miskawayh's *Tahdhīb*. Though they have also included a part on family and government, they have hardly departed from Miskawayh's views so far as ethics is concerned.

82. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:261, p. 573.

83. For the Qur'ānic view of *zuhd* and how it differs from the view which Sufis in general have of it see Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū' Fatāwā Shāykh Iṣlām*, (Riyadh, 1398), Vol. X, pp. 615–41, Vol. XI, pp. 27ff.

84. I would refer here to two ahādīth of the Prophet: 'The Muslim who mixes with people and bears patiently the unpleasant things which come from them is better than the Muslim who keeps away, and does not have patience with people.' [al-Tabrizī, *Mishkāt I-Masābih*, ed. M. Naṣīr 'I-Dīn 'I-Albānī, Damascus, 1961, h. no. 5087]; 'The Prophet was asked as to who is a better Muslim? He replied: The believer who fights in the way of God, staking his life and money. They asked again: Then who? He replied: The believer who takes shelter in any valley to avoid disobedience to God and to spare others his evils.' [al-Tabrizī, *Mishkāt*, *op. cit.*, h. no. 3796].

85. Plato, *Republic*: 352–3.

86. Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, tr. W. D. Ross, 1097<sup>a</sup> and 1106<sup>a</sup>, pp. 15–25.

87. Miskawayh, *Kitāb 'I-Sā'adah*, (Cairo, al-Maktabah 'I-Mahmūdiyah, 1928), pp. 33–4.

88. Miskawayh, *Tahdhīb 'I-Akhlaq*, (Cairo, al-Maktabah 'I-Ḥusayniyah, 1329 A.H.), pp. 9–11; See M. Abdul Haq Ansari, *The Ethical Philosophy of Miskawayh* (Aligarh, 1963).

89. Al-Ghazālī, *Mizān 'I-Amal*, ed. Sulaymān Dunyā (Cairo, Dār 'I-Ma'ārif, 1964) pp. 195, 209–10.

90. Al-Fārābī: *Al-Madīnat I-Faḍilah*, ed. Dr. A. N. Nādir (Beirut, 1956), p. 85; *Al-Risālah 'Fi 'I-Aql*, ed. Maurice Bonyges (Beirut, n.d.), pp. 31–2. See also M. Abdul Haq Ansari: *The Moral Philosophy of al-Fārābī* (Aligarh, 1965), pp. 25–7.

91. Al-Ghazālī, *Mizān 'I-Amal*, *op. cit.*, pp. 195–6, 207.

92. *Ibid.*, p. 219.

93. *Ibid.*, pp. 195, 221–6.

94. *Ibid.*, p. 383.

95. *Ibid.*, pp. 237, 331, 283.

96. Al-Ghazālī, *Hijād 'Ulim 'I-Dīn*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 13; Vol. IV, p. 277.

97. See *infra*, pp. 22–3.

98. Dr. Iqbāl defines the prophet as follows: 'A prophet may be defined as a type of mystic consciousness in which "unitary experience" tends to overflow its boundaries and seeks opportunities of redirecting or refashioning the forces of collective life' (*The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Lahore, Ashraf, reprint 1968, p. 125). After defining the prophet as a mystic, it is quite natural for Dr. Iqbāl to claim that the prophet undergoes a 'unitary experience' or has an ascent and a 'descent' or 'return' (p. 124).

99. Dr. M. Ibraheem al-Geyoushi, 'Al-Tirmidhi's Theory of Saints and Sainthood', *Islamic Quarterly*, Vol. XV, 1971, pp. 18–28.

Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammād b. 'Alī al-Hākim 'l-Tirmidhī (d. 280/893), a disciple of Abū Turāb 'l-Nakhsabī (d. 245), and an eminent Sufi himself is famous for his theory of the 'Seal of the Saints'. Among his books are: *Khatm 'l-Wilāyah, Kitāb 'l-Nihāj* and *Kitāb Ma'rifat 'l-Aṣrār*, ed. Dr. M. Ibraheem al-Geyoushi (Cairo, Dār 'l-Naqdah, 1977). [See al-Qushayrī, *al-Risvīlah*, p. 138; Iāmī, *Nafāḥāt 'l-Urs*, pp. 119–20; 'Aṭṭār, *Tadzhīrat 'l-Awliyā'*, Vol. II, pp. 77–84; Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Mahjūb*, pp. 177–9, 263ff.]

100. Al-Għażiċ, *Ihyā 'Ullum 'l-Din* (Cairo, al-Halabi & Sons, 1939), Vol. III, p. 24; *Al-Mađnūn bihi 'ala għayr ahlu (Raġe' il-Għażiċ*, Cairo, Jundi, p. 146).

101. Ibn 'Aṭṭār, *Fusūs 'l-Ḥikam*, (ed.) Affifi (Cairo, 1946), pp. 62–4, 134–6.

102. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:95, p. 238.

103. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:41, pp. 144–5; I:112, p. 270.

104. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:48, P. 164; III:91, p. 1460.

105. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:95, p. 238; I:108, p. 266; II:46, p. 998; I:272, p. 649.

106. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:54, p. 1341; Vol. I:48, pp. 164–5.

107. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:66, p. 194; I:59, p. 180.

108. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:59, p. 180.

109. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:99, pp. 1159–60.

110. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:32, p. 91; I:313, p. 826.

111. Shāh Wali Allāh, *Fuyūḍ 'l-Haramayn*, op. cit., p. 51.

112. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:22, p. 75; II:93, p. 133; I:272, pp. 649–50.

113. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:107, p. 261.

114. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:107, p. 262.

115. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:293, p. 770.

116. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:107, pp. 262–3.

117. Al-Qur'ān, 22:52.

118. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:107, p. 262–3; I:217, pp. 432–4; I:268, p. 629; I:30, p. 101.

119. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:36, p. 115.

120. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:31, p. 104; I:111, p. 270.

121. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:100, p. 251.

122. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:41, p. 144.

123. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:266, p. 594.

124. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:6, p. 874–5; I:261, pp. 574–5; II:4, p. 870.

125. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:43.

126. See *ultra*, p. 28.

127. Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, op. cit., p. 103; Ikram, Sh. M., *Rawd Kawthar*, op. cit., p. 164.

128. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. I:192, p. 384.

129. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:202, pp. 400–1; I:66, p. 194.

130. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:66, p. 194.

131. Wali Allāh, *Fuyūḍ 'l-Haramayn*, pp. 21–2.

132. Wali Allāh, *Anfās 'l-'Arifin*, (Delhi, n.d.), p. 35.

133. Sirhindi, *Maktabat*, Vol. III:121, p. 1559.

134. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:121, p. 1559.

135. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:87, p. 1440.

136. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:121, p. 1550–60.

137. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:8, pp. 35–6; I:9, pp. 38–9; I:32, p. 107; II:6, pp. 873–4.

138. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:121, pp. 1550, 1560.

139. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:121, pp. 1558–60.

#### Notes and References (Chapter Four)

1. Ibn 'l-'Arabi's compatriot, Ibn Sab'in (614/1217-669/1269) has a significantly different formulation of *wahdat l-wujūd* (see Dr. Abu 'l-Wafā' 'l-Ghanīmī 'l-Taftazānī, *Ibn Sab'in wa Falsafatuhu* (Beirut, Dār 'l-Kitāb 'l-Lubnāni, 1973). The Iranian mystic 'Abd 'l-Karīm 'l-Jili (676/1365-811/1408) has modified Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy on some very important points (see Reynold A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 1921, reprint Delhi 1976, pp. 77-142; Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, *Development of Metaphysics in Persia*, Lahore, Ashraf, n.d., pp. 116-33).
2. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:43, p. 147.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:43, p. 147.
4. The best work on Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy in English is that of Dr. A. E. 'Affifi, *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Dīn Ibn'l-Arabi* (C.U.P., reprint Lahore, Ashraf, n.d.). 'Affifi has also edited Ibn 'l-'Arabi's *Fusūs l-Hikam* with copious notes on it [Cairo, 1946]. Titus Burckhardt's *Introduction to Sufi Doctrine*, *op. cit.*, is in fact an introduction to Ibn 'l-'Arabi's doctrine. Henri Corbin's *Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn 'Arabi* (Princeton University Press, 1969) is a brilliant study of an aspect of Ibn 'l-'Arabi's thought. Dr. Toshihiko Izutsu, *A Comparative Study of the Key Philosophical Concepts of Sufism and Taoism* (2 Vols., Tokyo, 1966-67) has a statement on the main concepts of Ibn 'l-'Arabi's philosophy based upon his *Fusūs*. I have stated his basic doctrines in a chapter in my forthcoming work, *Sufi Perspectives on Experience and Reality*.
5. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:272, p. 650.
6. Al-Qur'añ, 8:17.
7. *Musnad Ahmad b. Hanbal*, (Beirut, Al-Maktab 'l-Islāmi, 2nd ed. 1978) Vol. III, pp. 135, 154, 310, 351.
8. Wali Allāh, *Hama'īt*, ed. Nūrul Hāq and Ghulām Muṣṭafā (Hyderabad, Pakistan, Shāh Wali Allāh Academy, 1964), p. 64.
9. Wali Allāh, *Al-Taqfiyyat l-Ilāhiyah* (Hyderabad, Pakistan, 1967) Vol. II, pp. 266-7.
10. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:272, pp. 650-1.
11. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:234, p. 494; Vol. II:1, p. 854.
12. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:272, pp. 651-2.
13. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:30, p. 101; I:289, pp. 734, 738.
14. *Ibid.*, Vol. II:1, p. 853.
15. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:286, pp. 697-8.
16. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:286, p. 698.
17. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:291, p. 756.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:291, p. 756.
19. *Ibid.*, Vol. I:272, p. 653.
20. Abū Iṣāq Ibrāhīm ibn 'Adham b. Mansūr (d. 160/777), a renowned ascetic and devotee came from an Arab family of Kufah belonging to the tribe of Bakr b. Wā'il. The story that he was a prince of Balkh in Central Asia, heard a heavenly voice admonishing him on his involvement in the world, left the palace and embarked upon the path of renunciation and devotion, is one of the legends that have grown around many a Sufi. A friend of Sufyān 'l-Thawrī (d. 161/778) and Fudayl ibn 'Iyād (d. 187/803), he is said to have participated in different *jihād* campaigns. [See for his life and views, 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Badawi, *Tarīkh l-Tasawwuf 'l-Islāmi min 'l-bid'yah* (Kuwait, Wakālat 'l-Matbi'āt, 1975), pp. 218-39.]
21. Abū 'Alī Fudayl ibn 'Iyād (d. 187/803), one of the great *mashāikh* of Khurasan, had at an early age a profound spiritual experience, gave up brigandry, came to Kufah, and devoted himself to learning hadith. A number of hadith scholars including Sufyān b. 'Uyayna and Yāḥyā b. Sa'īd 'l-Qattān have narrated ḥadīth from him. Intensely pious, profoundly conscious of death, humble and sincere, Fudayl lived an admirable life of simplicity and devotion. He is an example of the early piety of *zuhd* and *'ibādah*, unaware of the experience of *fana'* and *baqā'* which the later Sufis started to have. [See for his life and ideas, 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Badawi, *Tarīkh l-Tasawwuf 'l-Islāmi*, *op. cit.*, pp. 264-80.]
22. See Ch. 2, note 95.
23. See Ch. 2, note 35.
24. Abū Sa'īd 'Ahmad b. 'Isā 'l-Kharraz (d. 277/890), one of the leading Sufis of Baghdad, learned Sufism from Dhū 'l-Nūn (d. 246/861) and Sari 'l-Saqatī (d. 257/871). Jāmī says that he was the first Sufi to talk about *fana'* and *baqā'*. From his book on *al-Sidq* (ed. 'Abd 'l-Halīm Mahmūd, Cairo, 1975) and from his words preserved in the books of al-Sarrāj, al-Sulāmi, al-Qushayrī and Hujwīrī, we however, get no idea of what he thought of the nature of the experience. Sufis of his age described their experiences, rather than reflected on them. [See al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, P. 140; Jāmī, *Nafahāt 'l-Ums*, pp. 75-8; Hujwīrī, *Kashf 'l-Maḥjūb*, pp. 180-2; Abū Nu'aym, *Hilyat 'l-Awliyā'* (Beirut, n.d., Vol. X, pp. 246-9).]
25. See my paper: 'Abū Yazīd 'l-Bistāmī's Description of the Mystical Experience', *op. cit.*
26. M. Abdul Haq Ansari, 'The Doctrine of One Actor: Junayd's View of Tawhid', *op. cit.*
27. *Akhbār 'l-Hallāj*, ed. L. Massignon and P. Karauš (Paris, 1936) pp. 31-2 (also quoted by al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah*, pp. 32-4), pp. 29-30, 210, 47, 8, 95.
28. *Le Diwān d'Al-Hallāj*, ed. L. Massignon (Paris, 1955), pp. 41, 82<sup>1,2</sup>, 93.
29. *Akhbār 'l-Hallāj*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 108; *Le Diwān d'Al-Hallāj*, pp. 75<sup>1,3</sup>, 121<sup>4</sup>; Al-Hallāj, *Kitāb 'l-Tawāṣīt*, ed. L. Massignon (Paris, 1913), p. 31.
30. M. Abdul Haq Ansari, 'The Doctrine of Divine Command: A Study in the Development of Ghazālī's view of Reality', *op. cit.*, pp. 31ff. See *ultra*, pp. 73-4.
31. Nicholson, R. A., *Fi 'l-Tasawwuf 'l-Islāmi wa Tarīkhīhi*, Arabic trans. by A. E. 'Affifi (Cairo, 1969), p. 131.
32. Nicholson, R. A., *Fi 'l-Tasawwuf 'l-Islāmi*, op. cit. and his own book, *Al-Tasawwuf al-Thawran 'l-Rūhiyyah fi 'l-Islām*

34. Beirut, Dār 'l-Shā'b, n.d.), p. 175.

35. Sirhindī, *Maknūbāt*, Vol. I:272, p. 654; I:43, p. 147.

36. In my forthcoming book, *Perspectives on Experience and Reality*.

37. Muhammad Fadl-i-Haqq Khayrabādī, *Al-Rawd 'l-Majūd* (Delhi, n.d.) p. 4.

38. 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī, *Lawā'ih* (Lucknow, Nawalkishor, 1936), p. 23.

39. *Ibid.*, Vol. III:68, pp. 1371–2; III:71, p. 1375; III:109, p. 1516; III:114, pp. 1532–3.

40. Wali Allāh, *Fuyūd 'l-Haramayn*, *op. cit.*, p. 4; see also *al-Taqhīmat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 274ff.

41. See the chapter on Wali Allāh in my forthcoming book, *Perspectives on Experience and Reality*; see note 46.

42. Wali Allāh, *al-Taqhīmat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, Vol. II, pp. 263–4.

43. Wali Allāh takes up this task in what is commonly known as the Madinian Letter (*Maktub Madanī*) included in *al-Taqhīmat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 261–84.

44. Wali Allāh, *al-Khayr l-Kathīr* (Cairo, 1394/1976), p. 23.

45. Wali Allāh, *al-Taqhīmat 'l-Ilāhiyah*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 264.

46. M. Abdul Haq Ansari, 'Shāh Wali Allāh Attempts to Revise *Wahdat i-Wujūd*', *Islamic Quarterly*, London, Vol. 28, No. 3, 1984, pp. 150–65.

47. Shams 'Dīn Ḥabīb Allāh (1110/1699–1195/1780) commonly called Mirzā Mažhar Jan-i-Jānān, lived and died in Delhi. The renowned Indian scholar and Sufi Shāh Wali Allāh, who was his contemporary, witnessed his high mystical attainments, great position in the Naqshbandī order and his tremendous popularity (*Kalimāt Tayyibāt*, Delhi, Matba' Mujabā'i, n.d., pp. 164–5).

48. The manuscript of Shāh Ghulām 'Alī Yājīrā's *Kalimat l-Haqq* which I have consulted is in the *Nadwāt l-Ulamā*, Lucknow Library, and is listed No. 398.

49. I have consulted the manuscript of Shāh Raffī 'l-Dīn's *Damgh l-Bāṭil* which is in the Bankipur Library (India).

50. Shāh Muḥammad Ismā'īl, *Abaqat* (Karachi, al-Majlis 'l-Timi, 1960).

1. The Qur'añ for instance says: 'The worshippers of false gods say: If God had so willed, we should not have worshipped aught but Him – neither we nor our fathers – nor should we have prohibited any thing that He would not approve. So did those who went before them. Is the duty of the apostles more than preaching (the message) clearly?' (16:35).

2. But those who in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings' (Qur'añ: 3:7).

3. See *ultra*, pp. 33, 63–4, 66–7; Jāmī: *Nafhāt 'l-Uhs*, p. 75.

4. See my article 'The Doctrine of Divine Command: A Study on the Development of Ghazālī's View of Reality', *Islamic Studies* (Islamabad, Vol. XXI, No. 3, Autumn 1982) particularly pp. 37–8.

5. 'Affī 'l-Tilmīsānī, for instance, seems to have held this view [Ibn Taymiyah: *Al-Rasūl wa 'l-Masā'il*, ed. Rashid Ridā, Cairo, Vol. IV, P. 23].

6. See *ultra*, p. 116.

7. Sirhindī, *Maktabāt*, Vol. I:30, p. 101.

8. For a review of these views see George Makdisi, 'Ibn Taymiya: A Sufi of the Qādiriyah Order', *American Journal of Arabic Studies*, Vol. I, 1973, pp. 118–22.

9. George Makdisi, for instance, thinks that Ibn Taymiyah condemned the pantheistic Sufism of the *Ittiḥadīyah*, as represented, for instance, in the doctrines of Ibn 'l-'Arabī or 'the philosophers and the Sufis influenced by them' (the paper, *op. cit.*, pp. 122, 129). Abū 'l-Hasan 'Alī Nadwī shows that he criticised the wrong practices (*bi'd īti*) of Sufism, such as invocation of Sufi saints, visits to their graves, etc. [Tārīkh Da'wat wa 'Azimat, Vol. II, on Ibn Taymiyah, Lucknow, 2nd ed., 1971, pp. 216–36]. There is a better appreciation of Ibn Taymiyah's comprehensive review of Sufism by Abū Zuhrah: *Ibn Taymiyah, Hayātuhu, 'Astruhū, Ārā' hū wa fiqhuhū*, Dār 'l-Fikr 'l-'Arabi, Cairo, pp. 196–209, 316–39; Dr. Muṣṭafā Hilmi: *Ibn Taymiyah wa 'l-Tasawwuf*, Cairo, 1982, and Thomas Michel: 'Ibn Taymiyah's *Sharh* on the *Futūh l-Ghayb*, *Hamdard Islamicus*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Summer 1981, Karachi, pp. 3–12.

10. For this task one does not have to be a Sufi; and most probably Ibn Taymiyah was not associated with any *silsilah*. Prof. Makdisi's evidence for his affiliation with the Qādiriyah order is not convincing. Thomas Michel seems to be right in his observations on Makdisi's view [his paper, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–4].

11. *Majmū' Faṭāwā Shaykh l-Islām Ibn Taymiyah*, compiled by 'Abd 'l-Rahmān 'l-Asīmī and his son Muḥammad, Riyadh, Vol. X, p. 82. This work will henceforth be referred to as *Faṭāwā Shaykh l-Islām*.

12. For these appellations and the names of Sufis see Rashid Ridā's collection of Ibn Taymiyah's writings: *Majmū'at 'l-Rasūl wa 'l-Masā'il*, Cairo, Vol. I, p. 179. [This work will henceforth be referred to as *Al-Rasūl wa 'l-Masā'il*; and *Faṭāwā Shaykh l-Islām*,

op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 516–17 and Vol. XI, p. 233.

13. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 516–17.

14. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 220–1.

15. Al-Shiblī, for instance, shaved his beard and tore his clothes in that state [Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām], Vol. X, pp. 382, 557].

16. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 168; *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 382, 557].

17. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, pp. 81, 83; *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. XI, p. 18. Ibn Taymiyah has reviewed al-Hallāj's life and ideas in a separate treatise: *Risālah fi 'l-Jawāb 'an Su'āl 'an 'l-Hallāj hal kāna Ṣiddiqan aw Zindiqan* [Dr. M. Rashad Salim, *Jāmi' l-Rasā'il*, Cairo, 1969, pp. 185–99]. Henceforth this will be referred to as *Jāmi' l-Rasā'il*.

18. Ibn Taymiyah has referred to the doctrines of the exponents of *wahdat 'l-wujūd* in many of his writings. In two treatises, however, he has discussed them at length. They are: *Ibtāl wahdat 'l-wujūd* [*Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, pp. 61–120] and *Haqiqat Madhhab 'l-Ithhādiyyin*, [*Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. IV, pp. 1–101].

19. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 176.

20. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 23.

21. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 78.

22. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 79–90.

23. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 59–72.

24. *Ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 42–3.

25. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. XI, p. 385; X, p. 339.

26. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 177.

27. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 83.

28. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, p. 340; *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 168.

29. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 219–20, 222; *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 168; Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-Risālah 'l-Tadmuriyah*, Al-Maktab 'l-Islāmi, Beirut, 1391 A.H., p. 138.

30. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, p. 338.

31. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 220.

32. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 341.

33. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 487, 497, 499; Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-Risālah al-Tad-muriyah*, op. cit., pp. 130, 135.

34. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 694, 712–14.

35. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 682–5.

36. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 668.

37. The Commentary on *Futūh 'l-Ghayb* is included in Vol. X of the *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, pp. 455–549. The more relevant pages are 482–9.

38. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, p. 498.

39. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 220; *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 166.

40. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 497.

41. Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-Risālah 'l-Tadmuriyah*, p. 137.

42. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, p. 167.

43. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 218–19, 337–8, 488; *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. I, pp. 83, 105.

44. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. IV, p. 64.

45. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 62–3.

46. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, p. 612.

47. Ibn Taymiyah, *Kitāb 'l-Radd 'ala 'l-Manṭiqiyin*, ed. Sharf 'l-Dīn, Beirut, p. 511.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 511.

49. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, p. 76.

50. *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 473. *Isiḥāb* is a principle in Islamic jurisprudence; it means that a thing will continue to have its original value of being legal or illegal unless there is an argument from the Shari'ah to the contrary.

51. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 544–5.

52. *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, p. 398.

53. Ibn Taymiyah, *Kitāb 'l-Radd 'ala 'l-Manṭiqiyin*, op. cit., p. 516.

54. *Al-Rasā'il wa 'l-Masā'il*, Vol. IV, pp. 86–7.

55. *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 84–6, 92–3.

56. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. XI, pp. 398–400.

57. Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-Furqān bayn Awiyyā' Allāh wa Awiyyā' l-Shayṭān*, ed. M. 'Abd 'l-Wahhāb Fā'ir, Dār 'l-Fikr, p. 145.

58. Ibn Taymiyah makes these points in treatises which he wrote on *tawbah*, *shukr*, *ṣabr* and *tawakkul*, as well as in his discussions on *riḍā*, *māhabbah*, *kharṣ*, *rījā* and *du'ā* in other discourses that are scattered throughout the two volumes of his writings on *Sulūk* and *Tasawwuf* [Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām], Vols. X and XI].

59. *Fatāwā Shaykh 'l-Islām*, Vol. X, pp. 396, 558–65.

## **PART II**

**Selections From The Letters of  
Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī**

# Sufism

## 1. Nature and Purpose of Sufism

### I

Vol. I:30 (pp. 99–101)

*The goal of Sufism is not to acquire an intuitive knowledge of reality, but to be a servant of God. There is no stage higher than the stage of servanthood ('abdiyat), and there is no truth beyond the Shari'ah.*

Man has been created to serve God. If love is kindled in man, whether in the beginning or during the course of his spiritual journey (*suhūk*), the purpose is to disentangle him from things other than God. Love is never an end in itself; it is only a means to realise servanthood ('ubidiyyat). One becomes a true servant of God when one is freed from the love and bondage of the world. Love is nothing but a means for an exclusive devotion to God. The last stage in the Sufi way (*walāyat*) is servanthood ('abdiyat); beyond it there is no other stage. At this stage the mystic finds no comparison between him and his Lord: he is wanting in everything, whereas his Lord is self-sufficient in essence as well as attributes. He sees nothing common between his essence and Divine Essence, between his attributes and Divine attributes, between his acts and Divine acts. He even avoids saying that the world is a shadow (*zill*) of God, for that implies comparison and analogy. He simply affirms that God is Creator and that he is created; beyond that he claims nothing. Some people are led in the course of their spiritual journey to the belief in One Actor; they see no actor other than God.

But the mystics (of the Naqshbandiyah order) know that God is the Creator and not the doer of acts. The doctrine of One Actor is the root cause of blasphemy (*zandaqah*). I will explain through an example. Suppose that a juggler, sitting behind a screen, conjures up forms of some objects, and produces in them some wonderful movements. Those who have penetrating eyes know that the creator of the movements in the forms is the man behind the screen, although the movements are performed by the forms. Hence they say that it is the forms which move and not the juggler; and they are right in what they say. The assertion of One Actor is an act of intoxication (*sukr*). The truth is that there are many actors, but the creator of acts is only one. To the same category of beliefs belongs the doctrine of One Being. It is the product of intoxication and ecstasy. The criterion for the correctness of mystical ideas is that they agree with the clear truths of the *Shar'*; if they diverge a hair's breadth, they are, to be sure, a product of intoxication. The truth is what has been established by the 'ulamā' of the *Ahl-i-Sunnah wa 'l-Jamā'ah*; all else is blasphemy and heresy, and the result of intoxication and ecstasy. Perfect agreement with the *Shar'* is possible only at the stage of servanthood; in all stages before that, there is always an element of intoxication. Somebody put a question to Shaykh Bahā' I-Dīn Naqshband: 'What is the purpose of *sulūk*?' He replied: 'The purpose is to know in detail what you know in brief, and to perceive in vision what you know through arguments.' The Shaykh did not say that the purpose is to acquire truths beyond the truths of the *Shar'*. It is, however, a fact that the mystic receives different ideas during his *sulūk*. But when he reaches the end, those superfluous ideas disappear in the air. He then perceives the same truths of the *Shar'* in detail, and comes out from the narrow enclosure of reason to the open space of *kashf*. The prophet receives truths through revelations (*wahy*), the mystic receives the same truths through inspiration (*iħħām*) directly from the same source, and the 'ulamā' of the *Shar'* get them through deduction from revelation and state them in principle. The prophet receives truths in detail, and so does the mystic. But there is a difference: the former truth depends on itself, whereas

the latter depends upon the former, and is subject to its authority.

## II

Vol. 1:266 (pp. 623-4)

*The object of Sufi tariqah is nothing but to produce conviction in the beliefs of the Sharī'ah and to facilitate the observance of its rules.*

After one has acquired right beliefs and subjected oneself to the rules of the Sharī'ah, one should, if God so wills, enter the path of the Sufis. But one should not pursue it in order to get something over and above the beliefs and the practices of the *Shar'*, or acquire something new. The purpose of following the Sufi way is to gain a conviction in the objects of faith that cannot be weakened by the doubts of a sceptic or shaken by the remarks of an objector. The conviction which is founded on arguments is not firm, and one who pursues reasoning does not get certitude. 'Know that it is through the remembrance of God that one gets the peace and satisfaction of the heart.' This is the object of the Sufi *tariqah* regarding belief. Regarding the practices of the *Shar'*, the object is to make their performance easy and spontaneous, to remove sluggishness, and to subdue the carnal self.

Likewise, the purpose of the Sufi *sulūk* is not to see the forms and images of transcendental realities, or behold colours and lights; they are nothing more than a play or fun. Material forms and physical lights are not less interesting if one wants to have fun; why should one leave them and run after the spiritual forms and lights, and take up austere and difficult practices for that purpose? Forms, these or others, and lights, physical or spiritual, are all created by God. He transcends them altogether; they are nothing but His signs and proofs.

What should I say about hearing songs, or performing

dances, or entering into a trance, or inducing an ecstasy! All the states and experiences which are produced by unlawful means are, in my view, a kind of temptation with which God tests men. People whom God gives latitude in this way undergo these states, experience union, and have revelations and visions in terms of the forms of this world. The mystics of Greece and the Brahmin saints of India had all these experiences. The sign of the validity of an experience is, first, that it agrees with the doctrines of the Sharī'ah and, second, that in order to have it one does not commit anything which is forbidden (by the *Shar'*) or which is doubtful. Know that music and dance are but frivolous games.

### III

Vol. I:97 (p. 241)

*The experience of fanā' and baqā' is the essence of walāyat; its purpose is to produce conviction.*

The object of man's creation is to worship and obey God as He has ordained; and the object of worship and obedience is to achieve conviction (*yaqīn*) which is the essence of faith. This may be the meaning of the verse: 'Worship and obey God till (*hattā*) you get conviction (*yaqīn*).'<sup>1</sup> For, *hattā* introduces a purpose as it introduces an end. The verse may, therefore, be taken to mean: 'Worship and obey God in order to get conviction.' In other words, the faith that one has before worship and obedience is a formal rather than a real faith which means conviction. God says: 'O you who believe! believe!<sup>2</sup> That is to say: 'O you who have a formal belief try to have the real belief by worshipping God and obeying Him as He orders.'

The object of *fanā'* and *baqā'* which are the essence of *walāyat*, is to acquire this conviction, and nothing else. If one understands *fanā'* in God and *baqā'* by God in any other sense which suggests the fusion (of man) into God, it is a blasphemous distortion of faith. Many things come from the

mouth of a Sufi in the state of intoxication, which it is his duty to eventually overcome, turn to God and ask for His forgiveness. Ibrāhīm ibn Shaybān,<sup>3</sup> one of the great Sufis mentioned in the *Tabaqāt* says: 'The real *fanā'* and *baqā'* consist in sincerely believing in the unity of God (*iḥkāṣ 'l-wāḥdāniyah*) and honestly living as His bondservant (*ṣūḥāt 'l-ubūdiyah*). Anything over and above it, is sheer error and infidelity.'<sup>4</sup> By God, what he says is true; his words witness to his rectitude. *Fanā'* in God means effacing oneself in carrying out the will of God. You may understand *ilā Allāh* or 'meditation leading to God' and *sayr fi Allāh* or 'meditation on God' on the same lines.

### IV

Vol. I:207 (p. 407)

*Visions and auditions are not the end of Sufism; they are mere shadows, and God transcends them absolutely.*

What should I say of the frivolous ideas of the Sufis, and what should I speak of their experiences. In the Hereafter, their experiences and findings shall not be worth half a penny unless they are weighed in the balance of the *Shar'*, and their revelations and inspirations will not be worth half a grain unless they are tested on the criterion of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. The purpose of pursuing the path of Sufism is to strengthen conviction in the objects of faith as stated *κατά Shar'*, which is what faith *real!*. —

the ability to perform with 'described in *fiqh*. There is no vision of God is promised in t in this life; the revelations a reveal give them nothing but t the joy of a semblance. God (*wardā 'l-warād*). I am in an im about visions and revelations discourage the travellers of this

which  
But  
is annihilated.  
And what  
perpetually

dances, or entering into a trance, or inducing an ecstasy! All the states and experiences which are produced by unlawful means are, in my view, a kind of temptation with which God tests men. People whom God gives latitude in this way undergo these states, experience union, and have revelations and visions in terms of the forms of this world. The mystics of Greece and the Brahmin saints of India had all these experiences. The sign of the validity of an experience is, first, that it agrees with the doctrines of the Shari'ah and, second, that in order to have it one does not commit anything which is forbidden (by the Shar') or which is doubtful. Know that music and dance are but frivolous games.

### III

Vol. I:97 (p. 241)

*The experience of *fanā'* and *baqā'* is the essence of *walāyat*; its purpose is to produce conviction.*

The object of man's creation is to worship and obey God as He has ordained; and the object of worship and obedience is to achieve conviction (*yaqīn*) which is the essence of faith. This may be the meaning of the verse: 'Worship and obey God till (*hātta*) you get conviction (*yaqīn*).'<sup>1</sup> For, *hātta* introduces a purpose as it introduces an end. The verse may, therefore, be taken to mean: 'Worship and obey God in order to get conviction.' In other words, the faith that one has before worship and obedience is a formal rather than a real faith which means conviction. God says: 'O you who believe! believe!'<sup>2</sup> That is to say: 'O you who have a formal belief try to have the real belief by worshipping God and obeying Him as He orders.'

The object of *fanā'* and *baqā'* which are the essence of *walāyat*, is to acquire this conviction, and nothing else. If one understands *fanā'* in God and *baqā'* by God in any other sense which suggests the fusion (of man) into God, it is a blasphemous distortion of faith. Many things come from the

mouth of a Sufi in the state of intoxication, which it is his duty to eventually overcome, turn to God and ask for His forgiveness. Ibrāhim ibn Shaybān,<sup>3</sup> one of the great Sufis mentioned in the *Tabaqāt* says: 'The real *fanā'* and *baqā'* consist in sincerely believing in the unity of God (*ikhlāṣ* '*l-wāḥdāniyah*) and honestly living as His bondservant (*siḥħat* '*l-ubūdiyah*). Anything over and above it, is sheer error and infidelity.'<sup>4</sup> By God, what he says is true; his words witness to his rectitude. *Fanā'* in God means effacing oneself in carrying out the will of God. You may understand *sayr ilā Allāh* or 'meditation leading to God' and *sayr fi Allāh* or 'meditation on God' on the same lines.

### IV

Vol. I:207 (p. 407)

*Visions and auditions are not the end of Sufism; they are mere shadows, and God transcends them absolutely.*

What should I say of the frivolous ideas of the Sufis, and what should I speak of their experiences. In the Hereafter, their experiences and findings shall not be worth half a penny unless they are weighed in the balance of the *Shar'*, and their revelations and inspirations will not be worth half a grain unless they are tested on the criterion of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. The purpose of pursuing the path of Sufism is to strengthen conviction in the objects of faith as stated by the *Shar'*, which is what faith really means, as well as to acquire the ability to perform with ease the duties of the *Shar'* as described in *fiqh*. There is no purpose beyond them. For the vision of God is promised in the next life and cannot be had in this life; the revelations and visions in which the Sufis revel give them nothing but the pleasure of a shadow and the joy of a semblance. God transcends them absolutely (*warā'* '*l-warā'*). I am in an impasse here: if I tell the truth about visions and revelations as it is, I fear that it may discourage the travellers of this path and affect their pursuit;

but if, on the other hand, I do not tell the truth, I fear that I shall be guilty of selling the untruth as truth in spite of knowing the truth.

[Note: See also letters, Vol. I:210, pp. 420–1; I:217, p.435.]

## V

Vol. I:22 (pp. 71–6)

*Walks are of two kinds: those who remain absorbed in God, and those who are returned to the world. The latter are superior to the former.*

Glory be to him who has combined light with darkness and joined the trans-phenomenal which is above space with the phenomenal which is in space; and glory be to him who has created in light such a strong love for darkness that it seeks to unite with darkness in order that it may through the union increase in its brilliance and grow in its radiance. It is just as when you want to polish a mirror in order to make it brighter, you coat it with dust so that it may shine more brightly by contrast with the blackness of the dust, and increase in its brilliance by contrast with the dirtiness of the clay.

When the light is infatuated by the beauty of its phenomenal love and overpowered by its union with the material body, it forgets the vision it had of the Transcendent, and forgets itself and its own existential qualities (*tawâbi' wujûdihî*). When this happens it goes down along with its love to the level of ‘the People of the Left Hand’ (*Ashâb 'l-Mash'âmah*) and is deprived of the honour of ‘the People of the Right Hand’ (*Ashâb 'l-Maymanah*). If it continues in that suffocating union and does not come out into the open air of freedom it is completely doomed. For it fails to achieve the goal for which it has been created, or develop the powers which it has been given. In short, it is lost and finished. But if, on the other hand, it is saved by God's grace and

redeemed by His mercy, it may rise up, remember what it has forgotten, and return to God saying:

To you is my Hajj and my 'Umrâh, O my love!  
Not to bricks and stones which others visit.

So if it is absorbed in contemplating God on proper lines, and concentrates on Him in the best possible way, darkness surrenders to it, and is submerged in its illuminations. When this absorption increases to an extent that it forgets the material adjunct altogether, and forgets itself and its existential accompaniments (*tawâbi' wujûdihî*) completely, it vanishes in the vision of the light of lights and reaches its goal only with a veil in between. At this moment it achieves self-annihilation (*fâna'*) both physical (*jasâdî*) and psychic (*rûhî*). If after this self-annihilation it subsists in that vision it completes its annihilation and subsistence (*baqâ'*). It is at this moment that it can rightly claim *wâlayat*.

After reaching this point it may remain completely absorbed in the object of its vision and forget itself in it forever. Or it may return to the world and take up calling people to God, the Great and the Glorious, in such a way that it lives with its inner self united with God and the outer being turned to the world. At this stage light is liberated from darkness embedded in it, in order that it may devote itself to God; by virtue of this liberation it is entitled to join the People of the Right Hand of God. To be sure, God does not have a right hand or a left hand; but we speak of His right hand, for it stands for favour, blessing and grace all combined. A hadîth says: ‘Both His hands are right hands.’<sup>5</sup> Darkness following light occupies itself in worship and obedience. I mean by the transcendental light the spirit (*al-rûh*), rather, the reality of the spirit; and I mean by darkness surrounded by space the soul (*al-nafs*). In the same sense I use the words: the inner self (*al-bâtin*) and the outer self (*al-zâhir*).

One may ask: How is it that the saints who are absorbed in God are conscious of the world around, attend to things and have intercourse with people? What does the annihilation of the self and perpetual absorption mean? And what is the difference between the people who are perpetually

absorbed and those who are returned to the world and asked to preach?

By self-annihilation and complete absorption I mean the absorption of the spirit as well as the soul after the soul has submerged itself into the illumination of the spirit, as I have explained above. One is conscious of the world through his being as a whole which is absorbed and annihilated in the illumination which is experienced by the spirit; but its various faculties continue to be conscious as before without any wrong happening to them.

The saint who is returned to the world, his soul after having resigned itself, comes out from the illumination and takes up preaching. He develops a feeling for the world, and because of that feeling his preaching is rewarded with success. As to the claim that the soul is a unity of which the senses and other faculties form parts, that may be understood in this way. The soul is related to the conical heart, which is in turn related to the spirit through the Comprehensive Reality of the Heart; all messages from the spirit first reach it (i.e., this Reality) and then through it all the faculties and organs separately. Hence it has in a sense a presence in the soul. This is the difference between the two groups.

Let it be known that the first group of saints are people of intoxication, and the second are people of sobriety. The first have their own honour, but the second are superior to them. The state of intoxication behoves the saints, and the state of sobriety behoves the prophets. May God give us the honour of the saints and favour us with the emulation of the prophets!

## 2. Mystic Experience

### I

Vol. II:99 (p. 1172)

*The Sufi experience of *fana'* and *baqā'* is only a matter of experience, it has no existential significance.*

*Fana'*, passing away from self, and *baqā'*, abiding in God, are experiential (*shuhūdī*) not existential (*wujūdī*). *M* does not become God and is not united with Him. The servant is servant for ever, and the Lord is Lord eternally. They are wicked heretics who think that *fana'* and *baqā'* are existential; that man discards his ontological limitations and unites with his Primal Source, who is free from all limitations and determinations; that he annihilates himself and abides in his Lord; and that like a drop of water which loses itself and mingles in the river, he casts away his individuating limitations and becomes one with the Absolute. May God save us from their blasphemous ideas!

Real *fana'* is to forget the not-Divine, to free oneself from the love of the world, and to purify the heart from all desires and wishes, as it is required of a servant. And real *baqā'* is to fulfil the wishes of the Lord, to make His will one's own will without losing one's self-identity.

### II

Vol. I:295 (pp. 776-7)

*The disappearance of individual identity in *fana'* is visual rather than existential.*

In the writings of some Sufis one comes across words like *mahw*, effacement, and *idmīhlāl*, dissolution. What they really mean by these words is visual effacement (*mahw nazārī*) not existential effacement (*mahw 'aynī*). The identity

of the mystic disappears only from his vision; it is never abolished in reality. In fact, to believe in the latter is heretical and wicked. A number of amateur Sufis have interpreted these misleading words to mean existential dissolution and have been guilty of blasphemy. They have denied punishment and reward in the Hereafter. They believe that as they had once proceeded from Unity to multiplicity, they would likewise return at the end from multiplicity to Unity. Some of these misguided people have upheld this dissolution as the 'Great Resurrection' and denied real Resurrection and Judgement, Bridge and Balance. They have gone astray and have led a lot of people astray.

I saw one of them citing in support of his view the following couplet of 'Abd 'l-Rahmān Jāmī:<sup>6</sup>

Jāmil our origin as well as our end is Unity and nothing else,  
We live amidst a multiplicity which is false and unreal.

He does not know that what Jāmī really means by return to Unity is a return in vision and experience only. The Sufi does not see anyone other than God, and all multiplicity vanishes from his vision. Jāmī never means the existential return. These people are just blind, they do not see that, no matter how perfect one becomes, one cannot transcend human limitations, imperfection and insufficiency. Hence the ontological return of multiplicity to Unity makes no sense. If they think that it would happen after death, they are infidels; they deny the reality of punishment in the Hereafter, and falsify the teachings of the prophets.

### III

Vol. I:266 (p. 589)

*God does not unite with anything, nor does anything unite with God.*

God does not unite with anything, and nothing unites with God. Some Sufi statements do suggest union, but their authors have not meant it. For instance, the statement, 'When his poverty is perfect he is God' smacks of union. But what it really means is that when the poverty of a mystic becomes perfect he realises that he is a pure non-being and that nothing exists except God. It does not mean that the mystic unites with God and becomes God, which is sheer infidelity and apostasy. God is beyond the baseless conjectures of the wicked. Our Shaykh used to say *Anā 'l-Haqq'* does not mean that 'I am God'; it rather means that 'I do not exist, and God alone exists'.

### IV

Vol. I:272 (pp. 654-6)

*The belief in the Unity of Being is not required for the realisation of *fanā* and *baqā*. Whatever is seen, heard or felt in mystical experiences is other than God; the mystic should negate them and realise that God is beyond them.*

The belief in the Unity of Being (*tawḥīd wujūdī*) is not required for attaining *fanā*' and *baqā*', or achieving lower or higher *walāyat*. For *fanā*', we need only the perception of One Being (*tawḥīd shuhūdī*) so that we can forget the non-Divine. It is quite possible for a Sufi to make his spiritual journey (*sayr*) and travel from one end to the other without getting ideas of the Unity of Being; he may even doubt if they ever occur. To me the way in which nothing of these ideas happen is the shorter way to the goal than the way in

which they happen. Also, the travellers on the former path normally reach the end, whereas the travellers on the latter path wander on the way. They satisfy themselves with a few drops and leave the river; they run after union with a shadow and lose reality. I have learned this truth from my own experience. May God show them the truth!

I have made my journey by the second route, and a lot of ideas of the Unity of Being have been revealed to me on the way. God has been particularly kind to me and pulled me to Him through the way of love (*sayr maḥabbī*). With His help I have crossed the valleys and climbed the hills that lie in this way. It is just by sheer grace that He led me to pass over shadows and in the end reach the Real. However, when I began to guide disciples, I discovered that the other way was shorter and easier. All praise is for God who guided us to truth; had He not shown us the way we would never have found the truth. Surely, the prophets of our Lord have brought the truth.<sup>8</sup>

[Note:] From the discussion (in the first part of this letter) it is clear that the existents are many and the world exists besides God. This fact, however, does not preclude the realisation of *fanā'* and *baqā'* or the attainment of the lower or higher *walāyat*. For *fanā'* means forgetting the not-Divine, rather than the negation of the not-Divine. What is required is that the Sufi should stop seeing the not-Divine, not that he should cease believing in the not-Divine and negate its existence.

This truth, obvious though it is, has not been known to many a renowned Sufi even; no wonder, if it has been hidden from the laity. They have confused the perception of One Being (*tawhid shuhūdī*) with the belief in One Being (*tawhid wujūdī*) and regarded the belief that there is only One Being there (*wahdat l-wujūd*) as one of the prerequisites of the Sufi way, and have condemned those who believe in two separate existences (of God and the world) as the ones who have lost the way and are misleading others. For many of them the knowledge of God is nothing but the knowledge of the truths of *wahdat l-wujūd*, and the perception of Unity in the mirrors of multiplicity is the final consummation. Some have even said about the Prophet that after he had completed

the mission of prophecy he was placed at the stage of seeing Unity in the mirrors of multiplicity. In support of it they cite the verse: 'Verily, we gave you the *kawthar*',<sup>9</sup> which they interpret to mean 'Verily, we gave (the vision of) Unity in multiplicity' (for the letter *wāw* of *wahdat*, Unity, lies in between the letters *k* and *thr* of the word *kathir* meaning multiplicity).

Such ideas are far below the dignity of prophecy. The prophets preach an absolutely unique God; whatever appears in the mirrors of qualified reality does not participate in His uniqueness, it is limited by qualifications and relations. May God give these people a sense of justice! They compare the achievements of the prophets with their own achievements, and think that the prophetic excellences are like their excellences. What grievous words of insolence do they utter.

The insect which is hidden in the stone,  
Its heaven and earth are nothing but the stone.

This lowliest of the creatures who had similar ideas in the beginning of his *suluk* is ashamed of them and turns to God for forgiveness. He rejects the possibility of perceiving God in the world on the pattern of Christian incarnation. Khwājah Naqshband<sup>10</sup> says: 'Whatever is seen, heard or experienced is other than God, and must be negated by the *kalimah* of negation (*lā ilāha illā Allāh*; there is no god except Allah): Hence the vision of Unity in multiplicity should also be negated. And whatever is to be negated is other than God. The words of the Khwājah have rescued me from this perception, freed me from the bondage of visions and perceptions, and lifted me from the so-called knowledge to ignorance and from gnosis to wonder. May God reward him for what he has done to me! It is for these words of his that I love him and have joined the group of his admirers. Saints other than him have hardly said such words, or hardly negated their perceptions and visions as the Khwājah has done. It is in this light that one should understand his words: 'Bahā' I-Din would have no knowledge (*ma'rifa*) of God, had his beginning not been the end of Abū Yazid.<sup>11</sup> In spite of his greatness Abū Yazid did not go beyond his perceptions and visions, and did not step out of the narrow

enclosure of ‘Glory be to me!’ Khwājah Bahā’ 1-Din, on the other hand, negated all his visions and regarded them to be other than God. Abū Yāzid’s ‘transcendentalisation’ (*tanzīh*) of God was nothing but ‘immanentisation’ (*tashbih*) in the eyes of the Khwājah, and his affirmation of God’s uniqueness only a comparison, and his perfection a defect. Hence his final ascent in which he did not cross the stage of immanence was the starting point for the Khwājah. For, one ‘immanences’ in the beginning and ‘transcendentalises’ in the end. I, however, think that Abū Yāzid was informed of his shortcoming towards the end of his life. For at the time of his death he said: ‘I did not know You except after an unknowing, and did not serve You except after the lapse of a period.’ He thus considered his first awareness of God a non-awareness, for it was not the awareness of God but the awareness of one of His shadows and appearances. Hence he did not have the real awareness of God; for God is beyond everything. Shadows and appearances mark the beginning of the way; they are only aids and means.

appears is a reflection or an image of that Unity, not the Unity itself. So the best thing for you at this stage is to repeat the words: *lā ilāha illā Allāh* (There is no god except Allah). You should go on repeating this *kalimah* till nothing is left in vision or understanding, till you come to wonder (*hayrat*) and unknowing (*jahū*), and attain annihilation (*fana*). Unless you reach wonder and unknowing, you will not attain annihilation. What you think to be *fana* is actually nothingness (*adam*); it is certainly not *fana*. First reach unknowing then you will realise annihilation; this is the first step on the way. Do not think of arrival (*wasi*) or meeting (*ittisā*); they are not yet in sight.

How can you reach Su‘ād!  
There are mountains in the way,  
And high peaks and deep ditches.

Your experiences are right (*durstūt*). But you must go beyond them. Blessed are those who follow the guidance and walk on the path of the Prophet (may God shower over him and his people His best blessings). My second advice to you is to stick firmly to the Shari‘ah and judge your experiences on its principles. If you feel any disparity in word or deed with the Shari‘ah (and God forbid that), you should fear that it may be your undoing. This is the way of the Sufis who are rightly established. And my best wishes to you!

## V

Vol. I:240 (pp. 503–4)

*The outcome of real fana’ and baqā’ is wonder (hayrat), not knowledge.*

Praise be to Allah, and peace be on His chosen people! I received your letter which tells of your commendable attainments; I was very much pleased to read it.

In the path of love a lot of strange experiences happen. You must pass over those experiences and stages, and try to reach the One who produces those states, and where there is no knowledge but ignorance. If after that you are given true knowledge, you would be really fortunate. Mind one thing: negate all that comes to you in vision and understanding, even if it is the vision of Unity in multiplicity. For the (real) Unity does not appear in multiplicity: what actually

## 3. Visions and Revelations

I  
Vol. I:130 (p. 330)

*What appears in visions is other than God.*

Ever-changing states and experiences are not to be relied upon. Don’t care for what comes and goes, what is said and

heard. The goal is altogether different: it transcends whatever you hear or see, feel or experience. These things are just like sweets or cookies to please the children of *sulūk*. Go beyond them. The real thing to seek is different from these petty things which are as unreal as a dream. If in a dream you see that you are a king, you do not become a king. However, the dream offers a hope; it is a promise. In the Naqshbandi *fāriqah* (may God bless their leaders), visions and experiences are not to be counted. You will find this couplet in their books:

I love the sun, I sing of the sun;  
I am not night, nor do I love night,  
So I never talk of dreams.

If one state comes and the other goes, there is nothing to be sorry for, and nothing to be happy over. Look for the One who is absolutely unique and indefinable. God bless you!

Transcendent. These people may be excused; hopefully, they will be treated as an erring jurist (*mujahid*), and exempted from punishment. But we do not know how God will treat their followers; I wish they were treated as the followers of an erring *mujahid*. But if they do not get that treatment they will have a hard time. Analogy (*qiyās*) or *ijīhād* is a basic principle of the Sharī'ah, and we have been ordered to comply with it. But this is not the case with *kashf* and inspiration (*ihām*); for we have not been ordered to comply with them. Inspiration (of a Sufi) is not binding on others; but *ijīhād* (of a *mujahid*) is binding on the common man. Hence we are to follow the *mujahid* scholars and have to believe in the fundamental principles of religion as they define. The words and practices of the Sufis which are opposed to the views of the *mujahid* scholars should not be followed. But one should refrain from vilifying them; one should rather give them sympathetic consideration. Their (objectionable) words should be treated as ecstatic utterances (*shāfiḥāt*) and should be interpreted non-literally.

One is surprised to see that a number of Sufis ask people to believe in their inspirations and revelations such as *wahdat 'l-wujūd*, persuade them to follow their ideas and threaten them if they do not put faith in them. I wish they would have suggested them not to deny those ideas, and warned them against denouncing them. To have faith is one thing, and to refrain from denouncing is another. Faith in these ideas is not necessary; but one should not denounce them either. For their denunciation is very likely to lead to the condemnation of their sayers, and involve in contempt and hatred towards the friends of God. In short, one should act upon the views of the scholars ('ulamā') among the People of Truth, and keep silent in good faith over the revelations of the Sufis, neither accept them nor reject them. This is the right course, the *via media* between extremes. May God show us the right path!

More surprising is the behaviour of some claimants of *tasawwuf*; they are not satisfied with their visions and revelations, which they consider to be a lower experience, but go further and say that it is possible to see God Himself in this life. They even claim that they see the inscrutable

## II

Vol. I:272 (pp. 657-60)

*In their visions of God the Sufis do not see God Himself; they only see His appearance or shadow; and the words which they hear are not related to God as speech to its speaker, but as a creation to its Creator. Sufistic utterances which conflict with this rule should be treated as shāfiḥāt: their sayers may be hopefully forgiven, but their followers who believe in those words might be liable to God's punishment.*

In my opinion the vision of God in the mirrors of contingent things which a group of Sufis consider to be perfection and which they believe combines transcendence with immanence, is not a vision of God; it is nothing except a creation of their imagination. What they see in the contingent is not the Necessary, what they get in the temporal is not the Eternal, and what appears as immanent is not the

Essence of the Necessary Being itself, and boast that what the Prophet experienced once on the night of his ascension they experience it every day. They liken the light which appears to them with the 'dawn of the morn' (*isfâr subh*) and believe that it is God the unqualified, and that its vision marks the end of the mystic ascent.

They also believe in talking and dialoguing with God. They say that God said this or said that; some even quote words from God that threaten their enemies or give good tidings to their friends. Some claim that they had a prolonged dialogue with God from the third-quarter of night till the morning prayer, and inquired about several things and received God's answers. Indeed they are arrogant and full of conceit; great is the insolence of their impiety.<sup>12</sup>

From the words of these people it appears that they identify the light with God and believe that it is the Essence of God itself, rather than its appearance or shadow. Certainly to call that light God Himself is pure lie, sheer heresy and unadulterated blasphemy. It is the utmost forbearance of God that He does not hasten to inflict on these liars terrible punishments or destroy them altogether. Glory to God who forbears from people even though He knows their insolence, and forgives them even though He has power to punish them! The people of Moses (peace be on him and our Prophet) were destroyed for only asking for a vision, and Moses himself was snubbed in the words: 'You will never see Me',<sup>13</sup> and repented for it. The Prophet Muhammad who is the best and the most loved of the creation, past and future, and who has been honoured with the unique favour of physical ascension, and who has passed over the Throne and the Chair and transcended time and space, even his seeing God is a matter of dispute among scholars, in spite of the fact that there are suggestions to that effect in the Qur'an. The majority of scholars believe that he did not see God. Imám Ghazâlî<sup>14</sup> says: 'The correct view in this matter is that the Prophet (peace be on him) did not see his Lord the night of his ascension.' But these self-deceived people claim that they see God every day, whereas the scholars are not sure of even one vision for the Prophet. God's curse be on these blockheads!

It also appears from their statements that they believe that the words which they hear are related to God as a speech is related to its speaker. This is clear blasphemy. It is wrong to think that words would proceed from God by way of speaking which involves order and sequence; for that is the sign of contingency. The words of great Sufis have led them to error, for they have also spoken of talking with God and of dialoguing with Him. But one should note that the great Sufis have not believed that the words are to God as speech is to the speaker; they have rather believed that the words stand to God as creation stands to the Creator. There should be no difficulty in accepting this. The words of God which Moses (peace be on him) heard from the sacred tree, stood with God in the relation of the created and the Creator, rather than a speech and its speaker. Similarly, the words which Gabriel (peace be on him and on our Prophet) heard, stood with God in the creation-Creator relationship. Nevertheless, the words were the words of God, and one who denies it is an infidel and heretic. In other words, 'the speech of God' refers both to the internal speech (*kalâm nafy*) and the worded speech (*kalâm lafzi*) which God creates without there being anything in between. Hence the worded speech is also the speech of God in reality, and one who denies it is an infidel. You should grasp this point clearly, it will benefit you in different contexts. May God guide us!

#### 4. Ecstatic Utterances (*Shāfiḥat*)

I left (*kafartu*) the religion of God,  
And I must stick to that infidelity (*kufir*),  
Even though it is evil  
In the eyes of the Muslims.

##### I

Vol. II:95 (pp. 1137-9)

*The experience of oneness ('jam')* and *the experience of difference ('farq')*, also called the *kufri-tariqat* and the *Islam-i-tariqat* and their characteristics. Ecstatic utterances (*shāfiḥat*) are the product of the former.

I received your letter in which you have asked about some utterances of the Sufis. My dear! the time is not suitable for writing or responding to your questions. But since you have raised them, I am under an obligation to give an answer to your questions. I would, however, be brief.

The basic thing that you should note in this connection is that as in matters of the Shari'ah we distinguish between Islam and *kufir*, similarly in matters of the *tariqah* we distinguish between Islam and *kufir*; and as in the Shari'ah *kufir* is defect and Islam is perfection, similarly in the *tariqah*, the *kufir* of *tariqah* is imperfection and the Islam of *tariqah* perfection.

The *kufir* of *tariqah* is the experience of oneness wherein reality is hidden and the distinction between truth and untruth disappears. In this experience the mystic beholds in the mirror of everything, good or evil, the beauty of the Unity he loves. Hence, he does not see anything good or evil, perfect or imperfect, except as a manifestation of that Unity. Hence he does not have the will to denounce (the evil and the imperfect), which arises from the distinction (between truth and untruth), consequently he is at peace with everything, all of which he finds to be on a right path. He draws pleasure from the Qur'anic verse: 'There is not a moving creature, but He holds it by its fore-lock. Verily, my Lord is on a straight path.'<sup>15</sup> He even identifies the manifestation with the Manifesting One, the world with God, and the servant with the Lord. These are the consequences of the unitive experience. It is in this state that Mansūr<sup>16</sup> said:

The *kufir* of *tariqah* bears a close resemblance to the *kufir* of Shari'ah, even though the *kāfir* of Shari'ah deserves condemnation and punishment whereas the *kāfir* of *tariqah* deserves love and rewards. For this *kufir* or hiding (the reality) is due to an overwhelming love of God in which everything other than Him has been forgotten, and is, therefore, acceptable; but the *kufir* (of Shari'ah) is due to sheer ignorance and insubordination, and must, therefore, be condemned.

The Islam of *tariqah* is the experience of difference after union, wherein distinctions come back and truth is separated from untruth, and good from evil. The Islam of *tariqah* has a close affinity with the Islam of Shari'ah: when the Islam of Shari'ah becomes perfect it becomes one with the Islam of *tariqah*. Rather both Islams are the Islams of the Shari'ah, the difference between them is the difference of the inner and the outer Shari'ah, or of the reality of the Shari'ah and its form. The *kufir* of *tariqah* is superior to the Islam of the form of the Shari'ah, although it is inferior and lower than the Islam of the reality of the Shari'ah.

The Heaven is lower than the Throne,  
But it is higher and superior to the earth.

The Sufis (may God bless their souls) who have uttered *shāfiḥ*, or spoken words which conflict with the Shari'ah, have done that in the state of *kufri-tariqat*, which is the state of intoxication and non-distinction. But the Sufis who have been graced with the Islam of *haqiqah* rise above such words, follow the prophets in their internal life, and emulate them in their external behaviour. One who talks *shāfiḥ* is at peace with everyone; for him everything is on a right path. He does not differentiate between God and the world, and does not believe in the duality of existence. If he has really attained the state of union and is stationed at the *kufir* of *tariqah*, he forgets everything other than God. He will be

acceptable, and his words will be taken as a product of intoxication, and will be interpreted non-literally. But if he has not attained that experience, and has not reached that stage of perfection, and still speaks *shaykh* and believes that everything is on the right path, and does not distinguish between truth and untruth, he is a heretic and infidel; because he wants to contradict the Shari'ah and falsify the mission of the prophets who are the channels of God's mercy to humanity.

In short, the words which conflict (with the Shari'ah) may be uttered by a righteous as well as a wicked man. For the former they are the elixir of life, for the latter the most deadly poison; just as the water of the Nile was sweet for the Israelites, but unpalatable blood for the Egyptians.

Here one treads on slippery ground: many Muslims who have followed the words of intoxicated people have lost the right path, and fallen into evil ways, and have ruined their religion. They do not know that ecstatic utterances are to be entertained on some conditions which are present in the ecstasies but not in others. Of these the most important condition is that the one who speaks them must have forgotten everything other than God; this is the supreme condition for acceptance. And the criterion to know the true from the false (Sufi) is to see who is steadfast in observing the Shari'ah, and who is not. One who is true will not violate any rule of the Shari'ah, even though he is under intoxication, and is not able to make distinctions. Mansūr, to be sure, said: 'I am God', but every night that he passed in the prison he offered five hundred *rak'at* of non-obligatory prayer with iron chains on his feet, and refrained from eating the food which was given by unjust hands, even though it contained nothing unlawful. But he who is wrong finds the observance of the Shari'ah no less difficult than removing a mountain. The verse: 'What you preach to them is very hard on them'<sup>17</sup> depicts his condition. 'Our Lord! bestow on us mercy from Thyself, and dispose of our affair for us in the right way.<sup>18</sup> And peace be on him who follows true guidance!

## II

Vol. I:95 (pp. 236-8)

*Sirhindī discusses five sayings of some great Sufis, and treats them as ecstatic utterances (*shāthāt*). The first two tell an essential truth, but their language is misleading and improper; he, therefore, tries to show what is their proper and acceptable meaning. The other three are essentially wrong, and he is not able to find an interpretation which may be acceptable.*

*In the light of the principle that he develops in discussing the first two sayings, Sirhindī interprets a sacred Prophetic tradition (*hadīth qudsī*).*

Man is a comprehensive being. That which is in all existents is present in man. This is true in reality in respect to the world of possibility, but in respect to the Necessary Being it is only formally true. 'God has created man in His form.'<sup>19</sup> The heart of man has the same comprehensiveness: whatever is there in the totality of man is there in his heart. That is why the heart is called the Comprehensive Reality (*Haqiqat-i-Jāmi'ah*). On the basis of this comprehensiveness some Sufis have talked of the expanse of the heart and said: 'If the Throne is put along with what it contains in a corner of the Sufi's heart he would hardly feel it.' Since the heart comprehends the elements and the heavens, the Throne, the Chair and the Soul, and embraces the phenomenal as well as the transcendental, the Throne and what it contains do not count much in the heart. The heart encompasses the transcendental, whereas the Throne along with what it includes belongs, notwithstanding its vastness, to the world of space, and, no matter how vast it is, is limited and bears no comparison with the transcendental.

In the view of sober Sufis, however, these words are the outcome of intoxication and the result of non-distinction between the reality of a thing and its symbolic form (*an-mūzaj*). The Throne of Glory ('Arsh Majid) is the theatre of complete manifestation (of God) and is too big to enter into the heart. What appears of the Throne in the heart is a symbolic form of the Throne, not the reality of the Throne;

and to be sure, that symbolic form does not count much in the heart which comprehends innumerable forms. The heaven, big as it is, appears along with many other things in a mirror; but this does not mean that the mirror is greater than the heaven. To be sure, the image of the heaven in the mirror is smaller than the mirror, but not the real heaven. I will explain my point by an illustration. We have in man a symbolic presence of the earth. But on this basis, we are not entitled to say that man is larger than the earth. On the contrary, the existence of man in comparison to the earth is like a tiny particle. The words under discussion are, in short, based upon a confusion of taking the symbolic form of a thing for the thing itself.

To the same category belong the words of some Sufis overpowered by ecstatic experiences: 'The comprehensive-ness (*jam'*) of Muhammad is more comprehensive than the comprehensiveness of God.' Since they believe that Muhammad participates in both the levels of reality, possible and necessary, they think that Muhammad's comprehensive-ness is more inclusive than that of God. Here again they have taken the symbol for the reality. Muhammad (peace be on him) comprehends the symbolic form rather than the reality of the Necessary. God, on the other hand, is the Necessary Being in reality. Had they differentiated between reality and the symbolic form of the Necessary Being, they would not have uttered those words. Muhammad is but a servant, limited and finite, whereas God is limitless and infinite.

Know that intoxication is a mark of saintship (*walāyat*), and sobriety is a characteristic of prophecy (*nubūwat*), parts of which are available to the most perfect followers of the prophets as followers by virtue of their sobriety. Bistāmīs exalt ecstasy over sobriety; Abū Yazid (may God bless his soul) said: 'My banner is higher than the banner of Muhammad.' By his banner he meant the banner of *walāyat* and by the banner of Muhammad (peace be on him) he meant the banner of *nubūwat* and exalted *walāyat* which involved ecstasy over *nubūwat* which meant sobriety.

Into the same category falls the statement of some Sufis: 'Walāyat is superior to *nubūwat*.' They think that in *walāyat*

one faces God whereas in *nubūwat* one faces the creation, and it is clear that facing God is better than facing creation. Some people have interpreted this statement to mean that the *walāyat* of the prophet is better than his *nubūwat*. To me such statements are far from the truth. For in prophecy the prophet does not face the creation only, he faces both God and the creation. His inner being is with God and his outer being with people. The one who faces people exclusively is a statesman. The prophets are the best of God's creation, and have been honoured with the best of God's favours. *Walāyat* is only a part of *nubūwat* which is the whole; hence *nubūwat* is better than *walāyat*, be it the *walāyat* of a wali or a prophet.

Sobriety is better than ecstasy which is included in sobriety as *walāyat* is included in *nubūwat*. Sobriety, pure and simple, which is available to the common man is not for discussion here; therefore, to exalt ecstasy over this sobriety does not mean much. The sobriety which presumes ecstasy is undoubtedly better than ecstasy. The truths of the *Shar'* which issue forth from prophecy are pure sobriety and whatever is inconsistent with them is the result of ecstasy. Men of ecstasy deserve to be excused; however, the ideas which deserve to be followed are the ideas of sobriety not the ideas of ecstasy. May God confirm us in following the doctrines of the *Shar'* (peace and blessings be on their giver); may God also bless those who say 'āmīn' on this invocation. What has been reported in a sacred tradition (*hadith qudsi*): 'My earth and My heavens do not comprehend Me; what comprehends Me is the heart of My faithful servant,'<sup>20</sup> refers to a comprehension of the symbolic form of the Necessary Being rather than His reality; for God is far from entering into a heart as we have explained above. It is clear that the heart's comprehension of Transcendence is in fact a comprehension of 'symbolic' Transcendence rather than real Transcendence as is the case with the comprehension of the Throne and what it contains. The heart never comprehends real Transcendence.

*Obedience to God lies in obedience to the Prophet. The words of Sufis that differentiate between the two obediences fall into the category of shāth and should be ignored.*

God says: ‘One who obeys the Prophet in fact obeys God.<sup>21</sup> Thus God considers obedience to the Prophet His own obedience. Therefore, the obedience to God which is different from the obedience to the Prophet is not obedience to God. To underline this point God has used the word *qad* (which we have translated as ‘in fact’), lest an ill-motivated person differentiate between the two obediences, or choose one against the other. At another place, God complains against people who differentiate between them: “They try to differentiate between God and His prophets, and say that they would believe in some and would not believe in others, or try to find a course in between: they are infidels in the real sense.”<sup>22</sup>

Some Sufis in the state of intoxication and under an ecstatic experience have uttered words that differentiate between obedience to God and obedience to the Prophet, and speak of choosing the love of the one over the love of the other. For instance, it has been reported that Sultan Mahmud Ghaznawi came once during his reign to Kharqan and put up his tents there. Then he sent his men to Shaykh Abū ʻI-Hasan Kharrāqānī<sup>23</sup> requesting the Shaykh to visit him, and instructed that in case the Shaykh was not willing they should recite the verse of the Qur’ān: ‘Obey God and obey the Prophet and the men of authority from among you.’<sup>24</sup> When his messengers saw that the Shaykh was not willing, they recited the said verse. Thereupon, the Shaykh said: ‘I am still occupied with God’s obedience, and feel ashamed that I have not moved to the obedience of the Prophet. What to say of the obedience to the ruler?’ This implies that the Shaykh considered that the obedience to God was different from the obedience to the Prophet. To be sure, this is a deviation from the truth. The Sufis whose experiences are

true refrain from such words, and believe that in all matters of Shari‘ah, *tariqah* and *haqiqah* obedience to God lies in the obedience to His Prophet; they are convinced that all obedience to God which is other than the obedience to the Prophet, is sheer error and heresy.

It is also reported of Shaykh Abū Sa‘id Abū ʻI-Khayr<sup>25</sup> that once he was with some people among whom there was a very respectable Sayyid from Khurasan. Suddenly an intoxicated Sufi (*majdhub*) showed up, the Shaykh turned from the Sayyid in order to attend to him. The Sayyid did not like the behaviour; thereupon the Shaykh said: ‘I honour you because of my love for the Prophet, but I honour this intoxicated Sufi because of my love for God.’ This kind of distinction, too, is not entertained by the Sufis whose experiences are true. For them opposing the love of God to the love of the Prophet is a product of intoxication, and is pure error. The fact is that at the earliest stages of *walāyat* it is the love of God which dominates, but at the stage of perfection which is akin to *nubūwat*, it is the love of the Prophet which is predominant. May God establish us in obedience to the Prophet which is obedience to God Himself.

## IV

*Some words appear to be shāth and their sayer cannot be exonerated from the responsibility of dishonouring the Shari‘ah.*

You have mentioned that Shaykh ‘Abd ʻl-Kabīr Yamani<sup>26</sup> says that God does not know the hidden (*ghayb*). My dear! I simply cannot hear this: it makes the Fariqī blood in my veins boil. These words don’t call for explanation!<sup>27</sup> or interpretation, no matter whether their sayer is Shaykh Kabir Yamani or Shaykh Akbar Shāmi. We must have the words of Muḥammad ‘Arabi (peace and blessings be on him), not the words of Muhyī ʻl-Dīn ‘Arabi,<sup>28</sup> Sadr ʻl-Dīn

Qunāwī<sup>29</sup> or ‘Abd ı-Rahmān Kāshī<sup>30</sup> we need the *nāṣṣ* (the text of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah), not the *Fāṣṣ* (the *Fuṣūṣ* ‘-Hikam) of Ibn ‘Arabī. Sufficient for us are the *futūḥāt madaniyyah* (revelations of the Prophet); we don’t have to bother with the *Futūḥāt Makkīyah* (of Ibn ‘Arabī).

God Himself declares in His Holy Book that He knows the hidden (*ghayb*), and characterises Himself as the knower of the hidden. Hence, to say that God does not know the hidden is sheer blasphemy, and nothing short of falsifying God. By giving another meaning to *ghayb*, the sayer cannot exonerate himself from the offensiveness of these words. ‘Grievous are the words which come out from their mouths.’<sup>31</sup> I do not know what led them to utter such words that flatly contradict the *Shar‘*. If Mansūr said: ‘I am God’ and if Bisṭāmī said: ‘Glory to me’, they might be excused, because they were overpowered by an ecstatic experience. But the words in question are not the result of an ecstatic experience; on the contrary, they are intellectual statements and concern understanding. They admit of no excuse, and hardly call for interpretation. If the sayer of these words wants to draw upon himself the contempt of the people, that too is evil and reprehensible. However, if at all he wants people’s condemnation, there are many ways to it; why should he take a course which brings him to the brink of infidelity?

[Note: See also letters, Vol. I:23, p. 80; I:41, p. 143; I:112, p. 269; I:220, p. 440; I:268, pp. 629–31; I:293, pp. 767–8; II:80, pp. 1113–14; III:33, pp. 1282f; III:119, pp. 1547–8.]

## 5. *Sayr* and *Sulük*

### I

Vol. I:144 (pp. 318–19)

*Meaning of sayr, and the description of its four stages: sayr ilā Allāh, sayr fi Allāh, sayr ‘an Allāh bi Allāh and sayr dar ashya’.*

*Sayr* and *sulük* refer to a movement (of mind) in knowledge which belongs to the category of quality; real movement is inconceivable here. *Sayr ilā Allāh* (i.e., journey to God) may be defined as a process of knowledge in which one moves from a lower to a higher knowledge, and from that to a still higher knowledge, till one reaches the knowledge of the Necessary Being. One arrives at this point when the knowledge of possible beings withers away and vanishes completely. This state is called *fana'* or the annihilation of the self.

*Sayr fi Allāh* (i.e., journey in God) is the movement of knowledge in the levels of Necessity, like names, attributes, states (*shuyūn*), relations and negations, till one reaches a stage which no words can describe, no symbols can indicate, no adjectives can characterise, and no relations can relate, and which none can know and none can comprehend. This *Sayr* is called *baqā'* (survival in God).

*Sayr ‘an Allāh bi Allāh* (i.e., journey from God with God) which is the third *sayr* is also a movement of knowledge from higher knowledge to lower knowledge, and from there to lower and still lower levels till one reaches the level of possible beings in a return journey coming down from the levels of Necessity. This is the gnostic (*al-‘ārij*) who forgets God through God, who returns from God with God, who loses yet finds, who is separated yet united, and who is remote yet close.

The fourth *sayr* which is *sayr dar ashya'* (i.e., journey in things) is knowing things, one after the other, after one has forgotten them altogether in the first *sayr*. Therefore, the fourth *sayr* is opposed to the first *sayr*, and the third to the second, as you see.

The *sayr* to God and the *sayr* in God are meant for completing *walāyat* which means *fānā'* and *baqā'*; and the third and fourth *sayrs* are meant for fulfilling the obligations of preaching which is the mission of the prophets and the messengers (peace be upon them all, particularly on the best of them). Those who aspire to follow these great personalities completely, must participate in their mission, as God has said: 'Say: This is my way; I call people to God on full knowledge, and so call those who follow me.'<sup>32</sup>

[Note: See also letters, Vol. I:287, pp. 702ff; II:42, pp. 965ff.]

## II

Vol. I:290 (pp. 740–4)

*Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi describes in detail his mystical experiences.*

When I decided to pursue the Sufi way, God very kindly led me to the great wali and gnostic and one of the leading masters of the Naqshbandiyah order, Shaykh Muhammad al-Bāqiq<sup>33</sup> (may God bless his soul), my teacher and preceptor, and the director to a path which begins from the end (*indirāj l-nihāyah fi l-bidāyah*) and leads you through all the stages of *walāyat*. He taught me the *dhikr* of *ism dhāt* (that is, the word Allah), and directed his spiritual attention (*tawajuh*) to me on familiar lines till I experienced great pleasure and intense longing that made me weep. After a day the feeling of self-negation (*bi khudi*) as known to these Sufis and called forgetfulness (*ghaybah*) overtook me. In that state of self-effacement I saw a vast ocean and found that the forms of things appeared as shadows in that ocean. This state was intensified till it overwhelmed me. Sometimes it continued for a quarter of a day, sometimes two quarters, sometimes the whole night. When I reported it to the Shaykh, he said: 'You have attained a kind of *fānā'*, and advised me to take care of that enlightenment (*āgāhi*).

Two days later, I attained *fānā'* in the proper sense, and reported to the Shaykh. He asked me to continue. Thereafter I attained the *fānā'* of *fānā'*. When I reported it to the Shaykh he asked: 'Do you see the whole world as one and find it united with the One?' I said: 'Yes.' Thereupon he said: 'The *fānā'* of *fānā'* in the proper sense is that in spite of seeing that union you go into a state of unconsciousness (*bi shū'ūri*). The following night I attained the *fānā'* as described by the Shaykh. I reported it to him; I also told of my feelings subsequent to the experience of *fānā'*. I further told him that I had got a direct knowledge ('ilm *hudūri*) of God, and that I had found that the attributes supposed to belong to me belonged to God.

After that I saw a light that comprehended everything. I thought it to be God. This light was black. I reported to the Shaykh. He said: 'You have seen God, but under the veil of light.' He further said: 'The expansion of light that you see is in the realm of knowledge, it appears due to the contact of Divine Essence with innumerable things, high and low; but it should be negated.' After that, that all-comprehending black light started contracting till there remained just a point. The Shaykh said: 'You should negate that point too, till you reach the state of wonder (*hayrat*).'<sup>34</sup> I did as he said, and that imaginary point (*nūqṭah mawhūm*) disappeared from there and wonder set in, wherein God was visible by Himself through Himself. When I reported it to the Shaykh he said: 'This presence (*hudūr*) is the presence which the Naqshbandiyah aim at, and this is what the *nībat* of Naqshbandiyah means. It is also called the presence (of God) without concealment (*hudūr bi ghaybat*), and herein lies the inclusion of the goal in the commencement (*indirāj l-nihāyah fi l-bidāyah*). In our order one acquires this *nībat* as others acquire *adhkār* and *awrād* from their preceptors in other orders (*salsilah*) in order to practise them and reach the goal. On the basis of this fact, therefore, you can imagine the heights to which Sufis in this *tariqah* may rise.'

This *nībat*, which is quite rare, was given to me within two months and some days after I had taken up *dhikr* according to the Shaykh's instructions. After that *nībat*, another *fānā'* was awarded to me which is believed to be the

real *fānā' haqiqi*. My heart expanded to such an extent that the whole world, from the Divine Throne to the centre of the earth, was no more than a small grain as compared to that expansion. After that I saw myself and every object of the world, rather every particle of it as God. Then I saw each particle of the world separately one with me, and I saw myself one with all of them, till I found that the whole world was hidden in one particle. After that I saw myself, rather each particle, so much expanded and enlarged that it could contain the whole world, rather many more worlds, in it. I saw myself and each particle as an expanding light entering into every particle so that all forms and shapes of the world had vanished into it. After that I found myself, rather every particle, sustaining (*muqawwim*) the world. When I reported to the Shaykh he said: 'This is the stage of true certainty (*haqq l-yaqin*) in *tawhid*, the stage of the union of the union (*jam' l-jam'*).

After that the forms and shapes of the world that I found to be God at first I saw them imaginary (*mawhūm*), and every particle that I found to be God without any difference and distinction (*bi tafāwut wa bi tamyiz*) I found illusory. I was thrown into complete wonder. I remembered in that condition the words of the *Fusūs* once recited to me by my father: 'If you like, you may call it the created; or if you like, you may call it God in one sense and creation in another; or if you like, you may express your inability to differentiate between the two.' These words calmed down my uneasiness. Then I went to the Shaykh and reported my condition. He said: 'The presence (*hudūr*) of God that you have is not clear. Continue your work till the Existent (*al-Mawjūd*) is differentiated from the illusory (*al-mawhūm*). Thereupon I recited to him the words of the *Fusūs* that speak of non-differentiation. He said: "The Shaykh (i.e., Ibn 'Arabī) has not spoken of the perfect state, and, of course, non-differentiation has been the actual state of some Sufis."

I continued my work as I was instructed. Within two days God showed me, by virtue of the attention of the Shaykh, the difference between Existence and illusion. Thereupon, I realised that the real Existent is different from the illusory; I found that the attributes and acts and effects that proceed

from the illusory really proceeded from God. I realised also that these attributes and acts are absolutely illusory (*mawhūm māhad*) and there is nothing in existence except God. When I reported this state to the Shaykh he said: 'This is the state of difference after union (*farq ba'd l-jam'*), it is the final end of human endeavour. After this one may realise that for which he has been endowed with necessary abilities. The masters of Sufism have regarded it as the stage of perfection.'

Let me recount. When I was brought to the stage of sobriety after intoxication and of *baqā'* after *fānā'*, and looked at every particle of my being, I did not see anything except God and found it a mirror for beholding God. From that state I was brought again to the state of wonder. When I was returned to myself, I found God with all the particles of my being rather than in it, and the first state appeared to be lower than this state. I was again brought to wonder, but when I was restored to sobriety, I saw God in that state neither one with the world nor different from it, neither in the world nor outside it. The way I had found God's accompaniment (*ma'iyah*), comprehension (*iḥātah*) and immanence (*siryān*) at the first stage, now disappeared altogether. In spite of that He appeared to me with those attributes, as if I felt Him. I also saw the world at that time, but it did not stand with God in those relations. After that I was brought to wonder. When I was returned to sobriety, I came to know that God stood with the world in a relation different from those relations. That relation was unknowable, and I saw God in that incomprehensible relation. I was brought again to wonder, and experienced a kind of contradiction. When I was returned to myself, I saw God without that unknowable relation: He had no relation with the world, neither knowable nor unknowable. I also saw the world at that time in that condition. I was given a special knowledge according to which there existed no relation between God and the world, although I saw both of them. At this time I was informed that the object of my vision (*mashhūd*) as described above, in spite of its transcendental character, was not God. It was rather the symbolic form of His creative

relation (*yūrat mithāl-i-ta'alluq takwīn īw*) which is above all phenomenal relations, knowable or unknowable.

How can I reach Su'ād!  
There are in the way high mountains,  
And deep ditches besides.

O dear! if I start telling in detail the experiences I have had, and the truths that have been revealed to me, the discussion will prolong. Particularly, if I discuss the ideas concerning the Unity of Being (*tawhid wujūd*) and the shadowy character of things, men who have passed their whole lives in the valley of One Being would realise that they do not know even a drop of that limitless sea. How strange that these people do not count me among those who have experienced the Unity of Being and consider me only a theologian who denies the Unity. They believe that to insist on the truth of One Being is the highest good, and that to go beyond that stage is a decline.

Some fools who are not aware of themselves,  
Have loved defect under the impression that it is perfection.

They argue in this matter from the words of early Sufis concerning the Unity of Being. God may show them how to do justice with these sayings. How do they know that those Sufis did not cross that stage and continued to stay there? I do not deny that one receives the ideas of One Being: that experience does occur. What I contend is that there are stages higher than that stage. If they call a man who rises above that stage the denier of Unity and choose to dub him as that, I do not want to indulge with them in discussion.

[Note: See also letters, Vol. I:13, p. 49; I:31, pp. 102-3; I:160, pp. 338-9; I:291, pp. 757-8.]

### III

Vol. I:71 (pp. 200-1)

*Spiritual exercises and austere practices which are not in accord with the Shari'ah are of no avail.*

To be thankful to God, which is our primary duty, it is necessary, first, to have right beliefs as defined by the People of Salvation, namely, the *Ahl'l-Sunnah wa'l-Jamā'ah*; and, second, to follow the practical injunctions of the Shari'ah as enunciated by the *Mujtahids* of this group; and third, to purify oneself on the principles laid down by the Sufis among them. The first two are obligatory, because they form the basis on which the structure of Islam has been raised; the third is required for perfection, since perfection in Islam depends upon it. Every action or practice which is opposed to these principles is a sin, a disobedience to God, and ungratefulness to that great Benefactor. The Brahmins of India, and the Philosophers of Greece have not lagged behind in austere practices and severe devotions. But as these devotions were not in accord with the Codes (*Shari'i*) of the prophets (may God shower His blessings on them in general, and on our Prophet in particular) they have not availed and will not save their practitioners in the Hereafter. Therefore, you must follow the Prophet and follow his Righteous Successors (*khulafā'-i-rāshidin*).

## 6. *Kashf*

### I

Vol. I:217 (pp. 432, 435)

*The kashf of a Sufi is not infallible: three causes for error in kashf.*

You have not written since long about your states and experiences. Anyhow, what is required is to follow the *Shar'* consistently without deviating a hair's breadth in belief or in action. The most important thing is to guard the state of the heart in relation to God. The more it is one of ignorance the happier you are, and the sooner you reach the stage of wonder (*hayrat*) the better. Visions of God and revelations of His names occur while you are in the way; when you reach the end, they rarely happen. At that stage, one desires nothing except ignorance (*jahālat*) and non-attainment ('adam yāfi').

What should I write about cosmic revelations (*kushūf kawnī*)! In this field the causes for mistake are many and the possibility of error is great. The occurrence of these revelations is as good as their non-occurrence. You may ask how it is that sometimes error creeps into the revelations of the saints, and something different actually happens. A saint informs, for instance, that so and so will die after a month or return home from his journey. But when the month is over neither happens. The answer is that the revelation (*makshūf*) may depend for its occurrence upon certain conditions whose details the recipient of the revelation could not discover, yet he told about it in categorical terms. There may be another possibility: The gnostic may come to know from the Preserved Tablet (*Lawh Mahfuz*) about a particular event, but that event might change, as it belongs to the category of conditional decrees (*qadā' mu'allaq*) of whose nature and liability to change he is unaware. In such a case, therefore, if he tells what he knows that might not happen. . . . Know that the decrees of God are of two kinds: alterable

and non-alterable. The former is subject to change and alteration, the latter is not. God says: 'My decrees do not change.'<sup>34</sup> This refers to the non-alterable decrees. About the alterable He says: 'He effaces what He will and confirms (what He will), and with Him is the Mother-Book (*Umm 'l-kitāb*).'<sup>35</sup>

Let me return to our subject. An error may sometimes occur in inspired ideas when intellectual premises which are well established to the recipient of inspiration but are in reality false, combine with the inspired ideas of the mystic such that he is not able to differentiate between them, and consequently, takes the whole thing as inspired. Thus error creeps in, and the whole becomes wrong, because a part of it is wrong.

It may also happen that a Sufi sees in a vision, or in a dream, some transcendental truth, and takes it on its face value as it appears. He interprets it literally and commits a mistake; he does not realise that the apparent form is not meant, and that he should understand it symbolically. This is another reason for error in revealed (*kashfiyyah*) ideas.

In short, what is categorically true belongs to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah that was given in the indubitable (prophetic) revelation, and was brought by the angel. The consensus (*ijmā'*) of the 'ulamā' and the *ijtihād* of the *muftiyyahids* is based upon them. Whatever is outside these four principles of the *Shar'*, would be accepted only when it is in agreement with them; and what does not agree will not be accepted, even if it is the ideas of the Sufis and received by them as inspiration (*iḥām*) or revelation (*kushuf*). The feelings and experiences of the Sufis will not be considered in the Hereafter worth half a penny if they are not attested by the *Shar'*, and their inspirations and revelations will not weigh half an ounce if they do not agree with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.

The purpose of following the Sufi way is first to strengthen the conviction in the beliefs of the Shari'ah, which is the essence of faith, and second, to make the performance of its duties easy. Nothing else is the object of Sufism. For the vision of God is promised in the Hereafter and is impossible to have in this life. The visions and illuminations over which the Sufis are happy, offer nothing but the pleasure of a

shadow and the joy of an image or a symbol. God is far above and beyond them. I fear that if I tell the real truth about visions and illuminations it will dishearten the travellers of the Sufi path and will pour cold water on their aspirations. But, on the other hand, if I do not tell the truth when I know it, I fear that I would be guilty of confusing truth with untruth. I must say that the visions and revelations that occur in the Sufi way must be tested on the touchstone of the vision and illumination which Moses (peace be upon him and our Prophet) had on the Mount. If they do not come true they should be treated as shadows, images and fancies. And most probably they would not come true, because the shaking and breaking (of a mountain) is not going to happen, which is an indispensable condition (for a true Divine appearance) in this life, irrespective of whether it occurs to the inward or the outward eye of the seer. In either case, shaking and breaking are necessary. Only the last Prophet (peace be upon him and other prophets) is an exception; he had the vision (of God) in this life, and did not move from his place. His followers who imitate him most fully may also have the vision, but they would not have it without a veil lying in between, whether they are aware of it or not. If [Moses], the Interlocutor of God (*Kalim Allāh*) fell unconscious in the process of the experience before he could actually have the vision, how can others endure it!

[Note: See also letters, Vol. I:107, p. 262; I:112, pp. 269–70; I:220, pp. 438–40; I:273, pp. 664–8.]

## Sufism and Shari‘ah

### 1. The Way of the Prophet and the Way of the Saint

#### 1

Vol. I:302 (pp. 795–801)

*The way of the saint is different from the way of the prophet: the former seeks to eliminate duality, consequently it is plagued by intoxication; the latter maintains duality and is marked by sobriety. In the former, one tries to eradicate will and other human attributes; in the latter the aim is only to eliminate their evil objects. One meets theophanies in the former, which are mere shadows of the Real; there is no love for the shadows in the latter. In the former, love is passionate and intoxicating; in the latter, love is perfect obedience. One opposes the love of the Hereafter to the love of God in the former; in the latter, the love of God is the love of the Hereafter.*

Know, and God may guide you, that *walāyat* is a nearness to God (*qurb ilāhī*) which has an element of shadow (*zilliyāt*) and is not without the intervention of veils. If it is the *walāyat* of the saints (*awliyā’*) it necessarily has a stain of shadow; the *walāyat* of the prophets is certainly free from that stain, but it is not without the intervention of the veils of (Divine) Names and Attributes; and the *walāyat* of Great Angels (*Mala’ A’lā*) goes beyond the veils of Names and Attributes, but it is not without the veils of states (*shuyūn*) and essential considerations (*i’tibārūt dhātiyyah*). Since prophecy and messengership (*nubūwat wa risālat*) are not stained by shadow,